

NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES



3 3433 06824691 1



ZFHF

GRIFFIN













THE  
SUFFERINGS OF CHRIST.

BY A LAYMAN.

*By G. S. Jones*

NEW-YORK:  
HARPER & BROTHERS, PUBLISHERS,  
82 CLIFF STREET.

1845.



Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1845, by  
HARPER & BROTHERS,  
In the Clerk's Office of the Southern District of New-York.

## P R E F A C E.

---

THE prevalent theory of the redeeming sufferings affirms that God is impassible, and therefore limits the sufferings of Christ to his manhood alone. This theory has pervaded Christendom, and stood the test of centuries ; yet have we been forced, by scriptural proofs, to the conclusion that it is founded in error, and that the expiatory agonies of our Lord reached not only his humanity, but his very Godhead. That our inquiry is of importance, no Christian will doubt. We have sought in vain for any satisfactory arguments to sustain the prevalent theory. The pulpit, so far as our personal experience extends, has been almost silent on the theme. We have looked into such theological treatises as have fallen within our reach. They abound in reiterations of the averment, "God is impassible;" but, with very few and scanty exceptions, they stop short at the threshold of that specious, yet unsupported dogma. We have betaken ourselves to our Bible. The result of our scriptural investigations will appear in these sheets. Perhaps our humble essay may elicit from abler minds more ample reasons in favour of this ancient and

wide-spread theory. If such reasons are drawn fresh and pure from the great scriptural reservoir, we shall readily become their willing convert. We seek not polemic victory ; our sole object is the development of TRUTH.

We shall be obliged often to repeat the sacred names of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost ; we trust we shall ever do it with becoming awe : if, in any instance, we should fail in this paramount duty, our contrition will be sincere, as our offence will have been unintentional. Nor would we approach our pious and illustrious opponents, dead or living, otherwise than with profound respect. Opposing what we deem their doctrinal error, it is necessary that we should speak with freedom and plainness. The cause of truth seems to require that our argument should sacrifice to false delicacy nothing of its directness. If, in the ardour of discussion, we should utter or intimate anything which may justly be deemed discourteous, it will be to us a subject of lasting regret.

We affix not our name to our unaspiring volume. The omission is not from fear of responsibility. Amenable to the judgment of God, we have no unbecoming dread of the judgment of men ; but, in very truth, we believe that our humble name could add nothing to what may possibly



be thought the force of our reasoning. Our name is unknown to theological lore. Of the writer it may justly be said,

“Along the cool, sequestered vale of life,”

He “kept the noiseless tenour of” his “way.”

Should any future exigency invite the disclosure of our name, it will not be withheld.

Whatever may be the fate of this imperfect and brief essay, the writer will retain one consolatory source of reflection. His feeble effort, in every page and in every sentence, will have sought to exalt and magnify the glorious ATONEMENT. If he errs, his error will consist in the attempt to elevate that most transcendent work of the Godhead to a point of awful grandeur, towering even above its scriptural altitude.



# CONTENTS.

---

## CHAPTER I.

The Trinity—Fall of Man—Plan of Redemption—Christ suffered in Divine as well as in Human Nature . . Page 13

## CHAPTER II.

Prevalent Hypothesis of God's Impassibility considered—Supported by Great Names—Correct when applied to Involuntary Suffering—Incorrect when applied to Voluntary Suffering—Argument of Bishop Pearson examined . 22

## CHAPTER III.

Hypothesis of God's Impassibility continued—Not a Self-evident Proposition—Incarnation itself implies Suffering—Prevalent Hypothesis traced to its Source in early Antiquity—Argument of Athanasius examined . . . . 34

## CHAPTER IV.

Prevalent Theory of Christ's Sufferings limits them to his Humanity—Necessary Result of Hypothesis of Divine Impassibility—Theory of the same Antiquity and Prevalence as Hypothesis—Object of our Argument stated—Remarks of Dr. Chalmers—Remarks of Mr. Harris—Who and what Christ was—His Synonymes—Definite Article should have been prefixed to Name by Translators—Scriptural Passages declarative of Sufferings of Christ . . . . . 45

## CHAPTER V.

Name of Christ—Its Compass and Power—Scriptural Language, how to be construed—Name includes both his Natures—Any Exceptions are created and explained by the Bible—No such Exception intimated in Case of his Sufferings—Christ's own Declarations, Luke, xxiv., 26, 46—His Name denotes Totality of his united Being, not one of its Parts—Union of his two Natures constituted holy Partnership, to which his Name was given—Name not applicable to the exclusive Suffering of the human Partner Page 62 .

## CHAPTER VI.

Phrase, the Person of Christ—Means nothing more than simple Name, the Christ—No Analogy between Person of Christ suffering from Pains of Human Nature and Person of ordinary Man suffering from corporeal Pains—Bishop Pearson again considered—Bishop Beveridge considered—Godhead of Christ suffered actually, not merely by construction—If Christ suffered only in Humanity, his Sufferings, taken in reference to his Divine Beatitude, were inconceivably small . . . . . 77

## CHAPTER VII.

Natures of Christ concurred and participated in all his Sayings and Doings—So in Heaven and on Earth—All his Sayings and Doings were in his Mediatorial Character, requiring Concurrence and Participation of United Natures—No Exception in Article of Suffering—Examples of Concurrence and Participation—Farther Examples in case of Miracles—Moanings on Cross in united Natures—Mediation a Suffering Mediation—Eternal Son “emptied himself” of his Beatitude as well as Glory on becoming incarnate 95

## CHAPTER VIII.

Had there been any Distinction between the two Natures of Christ in the Article of Suffering, it would have been indi-

cated in the Bible—Intellectual Character of Paul—Two Passages from 1 Peter, declaring that Christ suffered in the Flesh, considered and explained—Bishop Pearson again examined—Term Flesh, when applied to Christ, designates his whole united Being—Term Body, when applied to Christ, has the same comprehensive Meaning—So has the term Man . . . . . Page 112

## CHAPTER IX.

Blood and Death of Christ—Blood, when applied to Christ, has a Meaning more comprehensive than its ordinary Import—It means Totality of Expiatory Sufferings—Christ really died—Death reached both his Natures . . . 124

## CHAPTER X.

Death of the Eternal Son—Scriptural Passages proving it—His Exaltation—What was meant by his Death—Not mere Physical Death—Why his Sufferings called Death—Visible Expiration on Cross, but Representative of his viewless Death . . . . . 135

## CHAPTER XI.

Death of Eternal Son continued—His Suffering Substitute for Spiritual Death of Redeemed—Hence said to have “tasted Death for every Man”—Consisted in outpouring on him of God’s Wrath against Sin—Comments on second Chapter of Hebrews . . . . . 151

## CHAPTER XII.

Death of Eternal Son continued—Acts, iii., 15: Ye “killed the Prince of life.” 1 Corinthians, ii., 8: They “crucified the Lord of glory.” John, x., 14, 15: “I am the good shepherd.” “I lay down my life for the sheep”—The Lamb of the fifth Chapter of Revelation—John, iii., 16, 17: “For God so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son.” “For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the

world." Romans, viii., 32: "He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all" . . . . Page 164

### CHAPTER XIII.

Dismay and Perturbation of Christ before and during last Passion—His Apprehensions and Conduct contrasted with Human Martyrs, and Persons not Martyrs—Phenomenon not explicable on Supposition that Humanity alone suffered—Reasons commonly assigned for his Dismay and Perturbation, and Fallacy of such Reasons . . . . . 180

### CHAPTER XIV.

Calvary—Contrast between Christ and penitent Thief—Gethsemane—Speaker and Actor was Christ in both Natures—Sufferings there those of Anticipation—Indications of Dismay—It was the Anticipation of Spiritual, not Physical Agonies—Thrice-repeated Prayer—Appearance of Angel—"My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death"—What the dreaded Cup was . . . . . 194

### CHAPTER XV.

Humanity of Christ had not Physical Capacities to endure all his Sufferings—Body and Human Soul of Christ differed in nothing but Holiness from those of ordinary Men—Body can suffer only to limited Extent—So of Human Soul—Sufferings of Christ Infinite, or, at least, beyond Mortal Endurance—Christ's Physical Capacities not expanded at last Passion—If so, he would not have Suffered in our Nature—Shifts to which Prevalent Theory is put to reconcile Extent of Christ's Sufferings with limited Capacities of Humanity to suffer . . . . . 211

### CHAPTER XVI.

Christ's Anticipations of last Passion previous to Night of Gethsemane—Luke, xii., 49-51: "I have a baptism to be baptized with"—John, xii., 27, 28: "Now is my soul troub-

led"—John, xiii., 21: "He was troubled in spirit"—Hebrews, v., 7, 8: "When he had offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears"—Objection answered arising from Divine Prescience—Progress of Christ's Anticipations . . . . . Page 227

## CHAPTER XVII.

Proofs of Divinity of Christ's Sufferings derived from Old Testament—Fifty-third Chapter of Isaiah—Isaiah, lxiii.: "I have trodden the wine-press alone"—Zechariah, xiii., 7: "Awake, O sword, against my Shepherd"—Zechariah, xii., 10: "And they shall look upon Me, whom they have pierced" . . . . . 242

## CHAPTER XVIII.

Scriptural Passages ascribing Blessedness to the Deity—If they are more than Doxologies, they imply no Incapacity to sustain Voluntary Suffering—Divine Beatitude progressive—"Joy set before" "the Author and Finisher of our Faith"—Divine Immutability—Not impugned by our Argument . . . . . 257

## CHAPTER XIX.

Incarnation no Proof that God the Son had not Capacity to suffer without it—Probable Reasons of Incarnation—It presented Example of perfect Man—Brought Proofs of Gospel home to Senses of Men—Rendered Triumph over Satan complete—Affords abiding Memorial of God's Justice and Love—Incarnate God, in both his Natures, obeyed the Law . . . . . 272

## CHAPTER XX.

Objections to Prevalent Theory—Venerable for its Age and Prevalence—Miniature of its Outlines—Derogates from Simplicity and Fulness of Atonement—Not founded on Scripture—Imparts to Bible figurative Meaning—Lowers

Affection from Godhead of Christ to Manhood—Strengthens Unitarian Error . . . . .	Page 283
---	----------

# CHAPTER XXI.

Practical Effects of Doctrine of Divinity of Christ's Sufferings—Deepens Views of Sin—Exalts Justice of God—His Love—Magnifies Value of Soul—Affords sure Foundation of Christian Confidence—Elevates Views of Atonement	304
--	-----

APPENDIX . . . . .	317
--------------------	-----



THE

# SUFFERINGS OF CHRIST.

---

## CHAPTER I.

The Trinity—Fall of Man—Plan of Redemption—Christ suffered in Divine as well as in Human Nature.

THAT there is a God above us, “all Nature cries aloud through all her works.” To this voice of Nature, Revelation adds her imperative voice from heaven, proclaiming the existence and government of a wise, gracious, and universal Sovereign. The Bible informs us, too, that the Deity whom we worship is a triune God. “There are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one.”—1 John, v., 7. We quote this passage from the beloved disciple with the knowledge that its genuineness has been questioned. We believe the passage to be authentic; but, if expunged from the Bible, it would subtract only a single grain from the overflowing measure of scriptural proof that there are three persons in the Godhead. The Bible also

teaches us that the Trinity consists of three distinct persons ; united, not commingled.

A celebrated Unitarian preacher now deceased, whose simplicity, pathos, and eloquence have seldom been surpassed, has laid it down as a fundamental objection to the doctrine of the Trinity, that the plurality of its persons tends to divide and distract devotional love and worship.\* But had this distinguished man, with feelings so true to nature, forgotten, when he uttered the sentiment just stated, the blissful days of youth, when his gladdened eyes beheld, and his bounding heart leaped forth to greet, at the domestic altar, two distinct, yet united personages, who both claimed and received his undivided and undiminished reverence, and gratitude, and love ? Was his filial piety distracted by the plurality of its objects ? Did his heart yield a less true and fervent homage to his father, because the angel form of his mother was hovering around him, arrayed in the lovely habiliments of her own meekness, and gentleness, and grace ? Did he find it needful, for the full concentration and development of filial devotion, that one of his parents should be forever banished from the domestic hearth, leaving the other in cheerless solitude ? Did his youthful heart yearn for an amend-

\* Channing's Works, vol. iii., p. 73, 74. Sermon on Ordination of Rev. Jared Sparks.

ment of the laws of Nature, so that each family of earth should have, instead of two, but one solitary, lonely progenitor?

The objection, that the plurality of the persons of the Godhead tends to divide and distract devotional love and worship, has as little foundation in nature as it has in truth. If St. Paul, when caught up into the third heaven, was permitted to gaze, with adoring and melting eyes, on the glory and benignity of the Highest, his rapt vision was neither divided nor distracted by seeing, on the right-hand seat of the celestial throne, that Saviour who had died to redeem him, and, on the left-hand seat, that Holy Spirit who had regenerated, sanctified, and imbued with the balm of comfort his persecuted and earth-wounded soul. The three who "bear record in heaven" are a triple cord of divine texture, to bind the believing soul faster, and yet more fast, to the footstool of its triune God.

The social principle is a controlling element of the visible universe. In the humblest gradations of nature we see its prevalence and power. The fishes in shoals swim the sea; the birds in flocks skim the air; the cattle in herds graze on the plains. The subjects of the vegetable kingdom are gregarious. The rose,

“Born to blush unseen,  
And waste its sweetness on the desert air,”

is yet encompassed by sister flowers. Even the weed of the deserted field is not alone. When our attention is recalled to man, we shall find the social principle an elemental law of his being. Even of him in paradise it was said, by unerring lips, “It is not good that man should be alone.” If we ascend to the next highest grade in the scale of being, we may confidently presume that the social principle pervades angelic natures. Heaven would cease to be heaven to the angels if each was secluded in his solitary cell. The strains of the lonely harp would become feeble and plaintive, though stricken by the hand of a seraph.

May we not, then, without irreverence, venture to presume that the social principle reaches even to the Godhead; that he who made man in his own image, and after his own likeness, “and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life” from the redundant fountain of his own ethereal essence, retained in himself, in infinite fulness, that social element, with whose infusion he has so copiously imbued the rational tenants of this lower world, and whose sprinklings have pervaded every part of its animal and vegetable provinces? If we may, indeed, regard this as a great truth of heaven,

which mortality may contemplate without profanation ; if

“ Those thoughts that wander through eternity ”

may sometimes soar, with no unholy flight, to the pavilion of the Highest, what a theme of meditation, vast as the universe, unsatiating as the flow of a blessed eternity, may piety derive from dwelling on the beatific fellowship, with each other, of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost ! Infinite wisdom holds high converse with infinite wisdom ; infinite holiness commingles with infinite holiness ; infinite love takes sweet counsel of infinite love.

In that temple of the highest heavens, consecrated as the abode of the Godhead, each of its divine persons enjoys blissful and untiring communion with his two other glorious selves. Into this holiest of temples no discrepancy of views, no collision of sentiment ever enters. To the most perfect unity of action, thought, and feeling, the infinite personages, who make it their dwelling-place, are impelled by the elemental and immutable laws of their own being. Thus flow on, in high and incommunicable blessedness, the successive and cloyless ages of the triune God. It must be an iron-hearted theory which would seek to banish from the dwelling-place of the Highest

the delights of social and equal intercourse, and to consign to lonely solitude the eternity of the Sovereign of the universe. The doctrine of the Trinity is, doubtless, above the reach of reason ; but, when revealed, reason perceives and approves its fitness. The infinite Father can find no companion among the children of men ; they are worms of the dust. Even the hierarchies of heaven are but his ministering spirits. He must have dwelt in solitary grandeur, but for his holy and rapturous communion with his august brethren of the Trinity. What desolation would pervade the courts of heaven, reaching even to the sanctuary of Him “that sitteth upon the throne,” could a ruthless arm of flesh pluck from his right hand and his left the beloved fellows of his eternal reign !

It is not, however, our object to demonstrate, by a regular argument, the doctrine of the Trinity. Not that we should think its demonstration difficult, with the Bible open before us. But those into whose hands these sheets will be likely to fall need no confirmation of their faith in this fundamental article of our holy religion. We may, then, for the purposes of our argument, adopt it as a settled truth, that there are three distinct persons in the Godhead : the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost ; and that these three persons are equal in all their infinite attributes and perfections.

The fall of man was an astounding event in the history of the universe. A world, just created in all the freshness and loveliness of innocence, and pronounced by its Creator to have been "very good," was seduced from its allegiance by the prince of the powers of the air. The forgiveness of this apostacy without satisfaction would have violated the fundamental laws of the empire of the Godhead. The "angels who kept not their first estate," though their voices had so long helped to swell the harmony of the heavens; though they had been ministering spirits around the throne of the Highest; though, ere this world sprang out of chaos, they had shone as morning stars; though they had been foremost among the shouting sons of God, had yet been cast out, and were confined in everlasting chains of darkness. Had rebel man been forgiven without satisfaction, the purity of divine justice must have been tarnished forever more.

But how was rebel man, poor and utterly destitute, to yield satisfaction? The title to his new dominion had been cancelled by sin. If burnt-offerings would have sufficed, "the cattle on a thousand hills" were no longer his. He stood polluted, confounded, seemingly abandoned and lost. But pity had entered the heart of One, whose divine compassion was infinite as his omnipotence.



A voice issued forth from the innermost sanctuary of the Godhead: "Deliver him from going down to the pit; I have found a ransom."—Job, xxxiii., 24. The ransom for delinquents, justly doomed to eternal suffering, was to be paid in the suffering of their great Deliverer. The development of this plan of grace, so surprising to the heavens, must needs overwhelm with astonishment the dwellers upon the earth. It was the mighty movement of a God, and all its mysterious and progressive footsteps were to be the footsteps of a God.

Had it been decreed in the council of the Trinity that its second person should have suffered in the celestial court, at the very footstool of the throne of justice, human reason would have had no ground to interpose her speculative cavils. But infinite wisdom deemed it most fitting that the great Deliverer should suffer in the vestments of that fallen nature which he had so condescendingly and graciously undertaken to redeem; and that the new-made world, which Satan had fondly claimed as a permanent province of his own kingdom, should become the scene of the glorious triumphs of the cross. That this great atonement was not an illusion, but a solemn reality; that the second person of the Trinity, clothed in the habiliments of flesh, suffered in very truth for the re-



demption of our race in his divine as well as in his human nature, it will be the object of these pages to establish by scriptural proofs.

## CHAPTER II.

Prevalent Hypothesis of God's Impassibility considered—Supported by Great Names—Correct when applied to Involuntary Suffering—Incorrect when applied to Voluntary Suffering—Argument of Bishop Pearson examined.

WE are met at the very threshold of our argument with the preliminary objection that the divine nature is impassible, or, in other words, that God cannot suffer. This objection, if true to its unlimited extent, is doubtless insuperable; for if the divine nature of Christ is incapable of suffering, he must necessarily have suffered in his human nature alone. We must, therefore, pause at once in our argument until we have explored the foundations of this startling objection, lest we should come, unwittingly, into collision with the awful attributes of Jehovah. The hypothesis that God is impassible is stated broadly by its advocates without restriction, qualification, or exception. It applies, therefore, as well to voluntary as to involuntary suffering by either of the persons of the glorious Trinity.

If a dogma pertaining to the viewless attributes of the unsearchable Godhead can rest for its sup-

port on mere human authority, then the hypothesis in question is, indeed, to be regarded as impregnable. It has stretched itself over Christendom, and stood the ordeal of centuries. The Roman Catholic Church has adopted it as one of her settled axioms; the venerable Church of England has lent it the names of her Hooker, her Tillotson, her Pearson, her Barrow, her Beveridge, her Horne, and her Horsley; the Protestant Church of France has sanctioned it by the adhesion of her eloquent Saurin; the Baptist Church has added the name of her no less eloquent Hall; and the Presbyterian Church has crowned it with the accumulated authority of her Owen, her Charnock, her Edwards, her Witherspoon, her Dwight, her Mason, and her Emmons. To these high intellectual dignitaries a lengthened, and still lengthening list might be added from the dead and the living.

Against names so distinguished for talents, learning, and piety it is with unaffected diffidence that we venture to raise the voice of our feeble dissent. We should scarcely have entered on the arduous undertaking, but from our firm conviction that these illustrious personages have endorsed the hypothesis without that profound attention and discrimination which has usually marked the movements of their mighty minds. None of them has, to our knowledge, fortified it by a single quotation

from the oracles of truth, or devoted to it a single page of argument, with the solitary exception of Bishop Pearson. The brief remarks of that learned prelate will be noticed hereafter.

The other distinguished fathers, whose revered names we have recorded, have generally dismissed the hypothesis with a mere passing sentence. "God is impassible," or some other expression, of almost equal brevity, is the only notice they have bestowed on a proposition high as heaven, and vast as infinity. So far as we may judge from their writings, they received the hypothesis as a consecrated relic of antiquity, without pausing to inquire whether its materials were celestial or carthy. It passed from their hands, bearing no marks of ever having been tested by the touchstone of the Bible.

To the prevalent hypothesis, so far as it relates to involuntary or coerced suffering by the Being of beings to whom it is applied, we make no objection. It would be both irrational and irreverent to imagine that the Omnipotent could be forced to suffer against his own volition. No hostile darts can pierce the thick "bosses of his bucklers."—Job, xv., 26. Once, in the history of the universe, has the futile experiment been made. The malecontents of heaven, a mighty host, aspired to shake

the throne of the Highest. Their catastrophe has engraved on the walls of the celestial city and on the vaults of hell a lesson lasting as eternity. God's impassibility to coerced suffering is a plain and palpable principle of natural religion, resulting inevitably from his attributes of infinite knowledge, infinite wisdom, and infinite power.

But as we enter the sphere of voluntary suffering, the question assumes a new and very different aspect. We are, indeed, still met at the threshold with the ever-present hypothesis, "God is impassible." But upon what authority do its adherents apply their standing axiom to the suffering of one of the persons of the Trinity, emanating from his own free volition and sovereign choice? They hold the affirmative of their hypothesis. The rules of evidence, matured and sanctioned by the wisdom of ages, devolve on them the burden of proof. To the living alone can we appeal; and from them we solemnly invoke the proof of an hypothesis gratuitously advanced, and which commingles itself with the vital elements of Christian faith. We affectionately point them to the Bible as the only true foundation of a theory seeking to limit the omnipotence of the Godhead. The Bible gives them no favourable response. From Genesis to Revelation, both inclusive, there is not, to our knowledge or belief, a passage which intimates,

directly or indirectly, that one of the persons of the Trinity has not physical and moral ability to suffer, if his suffering is prompted by infinite love and infinite wisdom.

Do the advocates of the hypothesis of the divine impassibility appeal to the Areopagus of human reason, that proud tribunal, to which even the heathen gods were said to have referred their controversies? We respectfully, yet confidently, meet them there. From none of the physical attributes of the Deity can human reason legitimately draw her bold inference, that one of the persons of the Trinity, to whom "all things are possible," may not, in the plenitude of his omnipotence, become the recipient of voluntary suffering. God indeed is a Spirit; but that a spirit can suffer is fearfully demonstrated in the history of the universe.

Is the inability of a person of the Trinity to suffer, when, in his benignant, and wise, and infinite discretion he elects to become a Sufferer, to be deduced from any of the moral attributes of the Deity? It is indeed a blessed truth, that God will not transcend any of the holy elements which constitute his august being. It is revealed to us that he cannot violate the awful sanctity of his truth. That he can do no other wrong, is justly to be in-

ferred from his own blessed oracles. His causeless suffering might, therefore, exceed perhaps even the limits of his omnipotence. He is ever moved by that benevolence, which forms a ruling element of his nature, to elevate, to the highest practicable point, the general happiness of the universe. Of that universe he is himself the soul; the infinite, to which all creation is but the finite. His needless suffering, then, would unspeakably subtract from the totality of universal bliss, and might thus transcend the immutable limits of his moral being.

But if one of the persons of the Trinity elects voluntarily to suffer for some adequate cause; some cause deeply affecting the happiness of the universe; some cause intimately connected with the glory of those who sit upon the throne; some cause sanctioned in the conclave of the Highest; some cause worthy to move a God: dare human reason interpose her puny veto against the mighty resolution? Would reasoning pride scale the highest heavens, and, standing at the entrance of the divine pavilion, proclaim, in the hearing of astonished cherubim and seraphim, that Omnipotence lacks physical or moral ability to become the willing recipient of suffering, prompted by its own ineffable love, and sanctioned by its own unerring wisdom?

On the abstract question of the capacity of the divine nature to suffer of its own free volition, we would not, for ourselves, have ventured gratuitously to speculate. Upon a theme so lofty and so sacred, we should have chosen to preserve a profound and reverent silence. But when we find it, as we suppose, recorded in the sacred oracles, that the second person of the Godhead actually suffered for the redemption of our fallen race; when our credence to that august truth is interdicted by the hypothesis, "God is impassible," with a voice of power heard, and echoed, and reverberated along the track of ages; when that hypothesis, to retain its own claim to infallibility, must change into figures of speech some of the plainest declarations of holy writ, it becomes the right and the duty even of a private Christian to explore respectfully, yet fearlessly, the foundations of a dogma deeply fortified, it is true, in human authority, and hallowed by the lapse of hoary-headed Time, yet scarcely claiming to repose itself on the basis of revelation.

That the Son of God should have suffered in his divine nature for the redemption of man is not more startling to human reason than the stupendous fact of his incarnation. If, at the time of the first manifestation of divinity in the flesh, the angel of the Lord, instead of announcing the event to



the humble shepherds of Bethlehem, had appeared in the midst of an assemblage of Athenian philosophers, made up from the schools of Zeno, Aristotle, and Epicurus, proclaiming to them the "good tidings of great joy," and benignly expounding the spirituality, the ethereal nature, and all the infinite attributes of the infant Deity, the incarnation of such a being for the remission of mortal sins must have seemed "unto the Greeks foolishness." The heavenly envoy would have been held "to be a setter forth of strange gods."—Acts, xvii., 18. Philosophic incredulity would have treated as a fable of mythology the mysterious message of grace. Peripatetic subtlety might boldly have sought to scan the spiritual anatomy of the revealed God, and dared to pronounce its puny decree, that the holy enigma of his incarnation was a physical or moral impossibility. Yet, if there is demonstration on earth, or truth in heaven, the Son of God, the second person of the glorious Trinity, did, in very fact, become incarnate for the redemption of man.

We have promised to notice the brief argument of Bishop Pearson on the divine impassibility. That we may be sure to do him justice, we give the substantial parts of his remarks in his own words. He says: "The divine nature is of infinite and eternal happiness, never to be disturbed by

the least degree of infelicity, and therefore subject to no sense of misery. Wherefore, while we profess that the Son of God did suffer for us, we must so far explain our assertion as to deny that the divine nature of our Saviour suffered; for, seeing the divine nature of the Son is common to the Father and the Spirit, if that had been the subject of his passion, then must the Father and the Spirit have suffered. Wherefore, as we ascribe the passion to the Son alone, so must we attribute it to that nature which is his alone, that is, the human. And then neither the Father nor the Spirit appears to suffer, because neither the Father nor the Spirit, but the Son alone, is man, and so capable of suffering. Whereas, then, the humanity of Christ consisteth of a soul and body, these were the proper subject of his passion; nor could he suffer anything but in both, or either of these two."

"Far be it, therefore, from us to think that the Deity, which is immutable, could suffer; which only hath immortality, could die. The conjunction with humanity could put no imperfection upon the divinity, nor can that infinite nature, by any external acquisition, be any way changed in its intrinsical and essential perfections. If the bright rays of the sun are thought to insinuate into the most noisome bodies without any pollution of themselves, how can that spiritual essence contract the

least infirmity by any union with humanity? We must neither harbour so low an estimation of the divine nature as to conceive it capable of any diminution, nor so mean esteem of the essence of the Word as to imagine it subject to the sufferings of the flesh he took, nor yet so groundless an estimation of the great mystery of the incarnation as to make the properties of one nature mix in confusion with another.”\*

It will be perceived that Bishop Pearson’s first ground of argument is, that the divine nature of the Son of God being common to the Father and the Holy Spirit, if the Son suffered in his divine nature, then the Father and the Spirit must have suffered. It is an inflexible rule in the science of logic that if an argument proves too much, it proves nothing. Its proving too much is an infallible sign that it is intrinsically and radically erroneous. The whole argument is condemned. Now the fatal disease of the argument under consideration is, that it proves too much. It touches even the holy incarnation itself. Test the argument, by applying it to the incarnation instead of the suffering of the Son. The argument, thus applied, would stand thus: The divine nature of the Son is common to the Father and the Spirit. If, therefore, the divine nature of the Son had become

\* Pearson on the Creed, p. 311, 312, and 313.

incarnate, then must the Father and Spirit have become incarnate also. But we learn from the Bible that neither the Father nor the Holy Spirit became incarnate. The argument, if it proves anything, would, therefore, prove that the incarnation of the blessed Son was but a fiction. Thus the corner-stone of our faith would be removed from its place. Samson pulled down the temple of the Philistines. The learned and pious prelate would unwittingly demolish, if his lever was indeed the resistless lever of truth, that holy temple "not made with hands," whose glorious walls are founded on the incarnation of the Son of God, and cemented by his most precious blood.

The second ground of argument adopted by Bishop Pearson is, that the imputation of passibility to the divine nature would imply its "imperfection" and "infirmity." This would indeed be true, if it sought to expose the divine nature to involuntary or coerced suffering. But the supposition that one of the persons of the Trinity can suffer voluntarily, and for an adequate cause, argues no "imperfection" or "infirmity" in the divine nature; on the contrary, it relieves the divine nature from the "imperfection" and "infirmity" which the hypothesis of our opponents would cast upon it. Their hypothesis says that neither of the persons of the Trinity can in any case suffer. He cannot

suffer even from his own spontaneous choice and free volition. He cannot suffer, however strongly infinite wisdom and infinite love might urge his suffering. If the universe was threatened with ruin, he could not suffer to save it, for his suffering would be interdicted by the fixed and unbending laws of his being. And would not such an incapacity to suffer imply "imperfection" and "infirmity" in the divine nature? It is our opponents, then, and not we, who would attach to the divine nature this "imperfection" and "infirmity." It is they, and not we, who would thus hamper Omnipotence by fetters made in the forges of earth.

## CHAPTER III.

Hypothesis of God's Impassibility continued—Not a Self-evident Proposition—Incarnation itself implies Suffering—Prevalent Hypothesis Traced to its Source in early Antiquity—Argument of Athanasius examined.

THE hypothesis of God's impassibility to voluntary sufferings is not a self-evident proposition. It carries not demonstration on its face; it proves not itself; it requires extraneous confirmation. From whence is such confirmation to be derived? It is yielded neither by the Bible nor by the deliberative process of sound reasoning. The prevalent hypothesis, then, rests on opinion alone. But unsupported opinion, though emanating from the wisest and the best, is incompetent, however long continued or widely diffused, to sustain a dogma claiming the place of a corner-stone in the structure of Christian faith. The opinion of one man, or of millions, of one age, or of successive ages, is not the test of theological truth. Christianity should be the last to recognise such test. She repudiated it by her own example. Her first achievement on earth was her unsparing invasion of the empire of ancient and almost unanimous opinion. Should she admit that the force of opinion can impart to religious belief the stamp of

truth, she must, to be consistent, spare the deep-seated, and wide-spread, and time-consecrated superstitions of Africa and of India. An insulated opinion on theological tenets, without support, is but a cipher. Such unsupported opinion, however multiplied, cannot form a unit.

The incarnation itself is a death-blow to the hypothesis of God's impassibility. If the Godhead is of necessity impassible, one of its august persons could not have become incarnate. The mighty Being who, in the fifth verse of the seventeenth chapter of John, uttered the prayer, "And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was," could have been none other than the second person of the Trinity, clothed, indeed, in flesh. The prayer itself demonstrates that the Supplicant was not of earth, that he had come down from heaven, that he had existed there, and enjoyed the intimate fellowship of the Father before the world was created. It contains intrinsic evidence that, at the time of the prayer, the divine Supplicant was sustaining the temporary privation of his glorious fellowship with the infinite Father, and that he longed to have it restored. His prayer breathed forth his deep consciousness of the severity of the bereavement. It evinced a bereavement which had marred for a time his infinite beatitude. His



eclipsed beatitude was not, for the moment, like the ineffable beatitude which he had enjoyed before his incarnation. This very bereavement is but another name for suffering.

There is a passage in the epistles german to that upon which we have been commenting: "Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men; and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross."—Philippians, ii., 6, 7, 8. The words in this passage translated "made himself of no reputation," should, in justice, have been rendered, "emptied himself." That is their literal meaning. By the substitution of their own language, the translators may have gained something in elegance; they have lost much in strength. Our argument prefers the plain Doric of Paul to the more fastidious style of his translators.

The illustrious personage who had "emptied himself" was he "who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God." He was, beyond peradventure, the second person of the Trinity. Of what had he "emptied himself?" He had "emptied himself" of the "form of God"



for the "form of a servant." He had "emptied himself" of his celestial mansion to become a houseless wanderer upon the earth. He had "emptied himself" of the ministration of angels to wash the feet of his betraying and deserting disciples. He had "emptied himself" of the glory which he had with the Father before the world was created. He had "emptied himself" of his beatific communion with his august companions of the Trinity. And has privation no suffering? Say, ye exiled princes, is there no suffering in privation? Say, ye fallen families, whose fortunes have taken to themselves wings and flown away, is there no suffering in privation? Declare, ye lately bereaved widows, ye newly smitten parents, from the depths of your breaking hearts declare, is there no suffering in privation? The very incarnation, then, should have strangled in its cradle the earthborn hypothesis, "God is impassible."

We have taken some little pains to trace the prevalent hypothesis to its source in early antiquity. Not that we bow to the authority of the judicatory of tradition, verbal or written. We recognise but one Cæsar in this terrestrial province of the great empire of spiritual truth. That imperial, sovereign, infallible arbiter is the Bible. To this most august of potentates we reserve the privilege of appealing. It is an unalienable priv-

ilege; it is the sacred birthright of the Christian, guarantied to him by the last will of "the Alpha and the Omega," who was dead, and is alive again.

The prevalent hypothesis we have traced to the fourth century. Some brief intimations of the divine impassibility are, no doubt, to be found sparsely scattered in the writings of the earlier fathers. There are also in the earlier fathers some intimations, as we think, to the contrary. The fourth century, if it was not the creator of the hypothesis, was at least the first that formally incorporated it into Christian theology. The correctness of this position seems to be demonstrated by the letter written about the middle of the fourth century by Liberius, the pope of Rome, to Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria, asking his opinion on the impassibility of God, and submitting himself to the paramount authority of such opinion. The letter and the reply of Athanasius are contained in an early page of the writings of that distinguished bishop. If the Roman pontiff had found plenary evidence of the hypothesis in the word of God, he would scarcely have appealed, for its authority, to the word of man. Had he deemed the hypothesis an established article of Christian theology, he would not have sought to strengthen the sacred and firm-seated column by the frail prop of a private opinion. If he clearly perceived that God

had incorporated it into his own holy oracles, the head of the Catholic Church would not have submitted himself, in so essential an article of faith, to the judgment of Athanasius.

He of the fourth century, who gave "a local habitation and a name" to the prevalent hypothesis, was this same Bishop of Alexandria. That Athanasius was a great man, the intelligent reader has not to learn from these humble sheets. Though then young, he was the master spirit of the Nicene Council. He is the man whose name was borrowed to clothe with immortality that summary of faith afterward compiled, and baptized by the appellation of "the Athanasian Creed." His spiritual domination has almost equalled, in its extent and permanence, the intellectual empire of the illustrious Stagyrte. It was he of whom the great Hooker exclaimed, "The world against Athanasius, and Athanasius against the world!" This distinguished theologian wrote a regular and elaborate argument in favour of the hypothesis of God's impassibility and the kindred theory of the exclusive humanity of Christ's sufferings.

We have searched out this argument with profound interest and high-raised expectations. It may justly be regarded as the official proclamation of the fourth century in support of the preva-

lent hypothesis and its lineally-descended theory. It was written by him who is generally held to have been the great champion of primeval orthodoxy. The general father of Western Christendom had specially invoked his attention to the important subject. We may fairly presume that his argument was induced by the promptings of the papal letter. The world in every age may therefore confidently regard his exposition as having concentrated within its ample limits all that Christian antiquity could gather in favour of his doctrine from the freshly-inspired oracles, or glean from the writings of its uninspired, yet learned patriarchs. Of this elaborated argument we have appended a translation from the original Greek. We must beseech the kind reader to pause here, and, turning to the Appendix, listen to this oracular voice of the olden time before he resumes the thread of our unaspiring essay.\*

Supposing that the reader has complied with the closing request of the last paragraph, he will now be prepared to proceed with us in a brief review of the Athanasian argument, embodying, as it does, more on our subject that can probably be found elsewhere in the whole compass of sacred literature, ancient and modern, if gleaned and compacted together. The first ingredient that we

\* See Appendix.

justly look for in a theological argument is scriptural authority. The argument of Athanasius scarcely claims such authority for its support ; on the contrary, he seemingly wishes to have removed out of his way a mass of scriptural verballity, to afford an appropriate site for the erection of his reasoning edifice. He objects to a literal construction of scripture ; from thence we infer his deep conviction that the language of holy writ, if taken according to its plain import, must needs have excluded him from access to his building site. With more point than courtesy, he significantly intimates that the literal readers of the Bible are like "brutes;" nor does he allow them the rank even of "clean beasts" that "ruminate," because they chew not the meditative cud of subtle philosophy. The very corner-stone of the Athanasian hypothesis is thus founded on bold aberration from the ostensible signification of scriptural language.

This assumed right of man to amend the declarations of the Holy Ghost, Athanasius had been taught by at least one of his venerated predecessors. The celebrated Origen, in the tenth book of his *Stromata*, dared to utter the following startling sentiments, which, if uttered by us, would be held impious ; he says, "The source of many evils lies in adhering to the carnal or external part of

scripture. Those who do so shall not attain to the kingdom of God. Let us, therefore, seek after the spirit and the substantial fruits of the Word, which are hidden and mysterious." And again he says, "The Scriptures are of little use to those who understand them as they are written."

These sentiments of Origen seem to have been adopted by Athanasius. They are fully developed in his renowned argument. They form the basis of that bold hypothesis which, by its confident pretensions and its author's brilliant name, seems, for near fifteen centuries, to have dazzled the mental vision of the wisest and the best. Nothing can be more dangerous to the vital elements of Christian faith than this latitudinarian construction of the holy oracles. It commingles with the inspiration of heaven a controlling infusion of the philosophy of earth. It substitutes for the Word of the infallible God the fallible word of frail and presumptuous man. This latitudinarian interpretation of the Bible was the great moral disease of the first five centuries of the Christian era. It converted what should have been its "high and palmy state" into one vast receptacle of schisms and heresies. We would not do injustice to the primitive ages of the Church; their persecutions and martyrdoms, so patiently and so nobly borne, are deeply engraven on our memory; the

roll of impartial history unfolds, also, the imperishable record of their wild phantasies, their bitter intestine divisions, their frequent shipwrecks of the faith—the legitimate offspring of their reckless constructions of the oracles of truth.

Athanasius says that the Bible is to be construed with special reference to what human reason deems “fitting to God.” We hence conclude that the supposed unfitness of suffering to the dignity of the Godhead is the prime element of the Athanasian hypothesis. The syllogism of Athanasius, then, stands thus: It is not “fitting to God” to suffer. The God incarnate did suffer: therefore the incarnate God suffered not in his divine nature. The correctness of the syllogism turns on the truth of its major proposition, viz., the supposed unfitness of the divine nature for suffering. But that was a point for the decision of the conclave of the Trinity. In that august tribunal it must have been decided before the holy incarnation. We purpose to show, by scriptural proofs, that it was there decided adversely to the decision of the author of the prevalent hypothesis. From his philosophical syllogism to the inspired volume we bring our writ of review. We appeal from Athanasius to God.

In the course of our future argument, we shall



accumulate scriptural passages denoting that, besides the privations incident to his incarnation, the second person of the Trinity did, in very truth, suffer in his ethereal essence infinitely, or, at least, unimaginably, for the salvation of the world. To insert those passages here would be reversing the order of our argument. When they come to be introduced, if understood by others as we understand them, we must beg the kind reader to transplant them, in thought, to this identical place. When they shall have been thus transplanted, they will carry home to that time-consecrated, yet fallacious hypothesis, "God is impassible," the work of demolition more surely and demonstratively than could volumes of argument drawn from the storehouse of reason. Will not plenary proof from scripture, that the divine nature of Christ actually participated in his mediatorial sufferings, convince even reasoning skepticism that his divinity had physical and moral capacity to suffer?



## CHAPTER IV.

Prevalent Theory of Christ's Sufferings limits them to his Humanity—Necessary Result of Hypothesis of Divine Impassibility—Theory of the same Antiquity and Prevalence as Hypothesis—Object of our Argument stated—Remarks of Dr. Chalmers—Remarks of Mr. Harris.—Who and what Christ was—His Synonymes—Definite Article should have been prefixed to Name by Translators—Scriptural Passages declarative of Sufferings of Christ.

HAVING, in the preceding chapters, considered the preliminary objection arising from the alleged impassibility of the divine nature, we may now, it is hoped, pursue our inquiry, whether Christ suffered in his united natures, or in his manhood alone, without danger of impugning any of the attributes of the Godhead. The capacity of his divinity to suffer is not, of itself, proof that it actually suffered; nor can the question of its actual sufferance be decided by any mere reasoning process; it lies beyond the ken of our mental vision: the decision of the question rests on scriptural proofs.

The prevalent theory of Christ's sufferings limits them to his human nature. This theory was the sure result of the prevalent hypothesis, that God is impassible. If the divine nature was held incapable of suffering, then the conclusion must

have been inevitable that his sufferings were confined to his manhood. The prevalent theory, like its parent, was born in early antiquity. It has followed the footsteps of its progenitor, as the shadow pursues its substance, along the track of near fifteen hundred years. Like its parent, it has stretched its shade over continents and pervaded Christendom.

Since the maturity of the prevalent hypothesis, and its kindred theory, in the fourth century, their adherents have generally aspired to sustain them by naked opinions alone, multiplied, indeed, to an almost incalculable extent. With the single exception of Bishop Pearson, we have met with no modern author who has attempted to support them by anything that could claim the name of an argument. His brief remarks have already been partially considered. They will come again under review in the course of these pages. Whether the argument of Athanasius has self-sustaining competency to uphold a spiritual world, our readers, by turning to the Appendix, may judge for themselves.

Whether the redeeming God, as well as the redeeming man, suffered for the salvation of the world, is a question which the adherents of the prevalent hypothesis and theory have never, to

our knowledge, examined and fairly discussed on its scriptural merits, as a distinct point of theological inquiry. Holding the hypothesis of the divine impassibility as a self-evident truism, they have subjected to its control all scriptural passages bearing on the passion of our Lord. Such inspired passages as come into seeming collision with the hypothesis they regard as Oriental imagery. They understand them as mere metaphors and figures of speech. They deem the discussion of them superfluous, if not profane. They hold that, as the divine impassibility has become an elemental doctrine of the Christian Church, all debate upon the weight of scriptural proofs that the divinity of Christ bore its share in his expiatory agonies is forever precluded. They debar debate by a deep and mandatory call for the previous question. They will probably consider the invocation of scriptural authorities at this late day as a too bold impeachment of the irreversible decree of hoary-headed Time.

That Christ suffered in both his natures we believe to be a revealed truth of our holy religion. Nor is it the least interesting department of inspired lore. It opens a celestial paradise, rich in more choice and lasting fruits than bloomed in the terrestrial Eden. "Search the Scriptures" is the passport of God to its tree of knowledge. Yet

has an earth-formed apparition, clothed in the assumed vesture of an angel of truth, seemed to stand for centuries at its entrance, and, with its phantom sword, to interdict all ingress.

We design, by the blessing of God, to present the question relative to the nature and divinity of the mediatorial sufferings as a solemn issue to be tried, on scriptural evidence, before the inquisition of the Christian world. We assume the affirmative; we take upon ourselves the burden of showing that the divinity of Christ participated in his sufferings. Among the witnesses to be examined will be Isaiah, and Zechariah, and Matthew, and Mark, and Luke, and the disciple who leaned on the bosom of Jesus, and Stephen, and Paul, and Peter. The awful proclamations of the Holy Ghost will be invoked. An appeal will be made to the affecting declarations of the suffering, dying, risen God. We demand an impartial trial.

We shall address ourselves especially to plain, enlightened common sense, well read in holy writ, unbiased by deep-rooted theories, unfettered by the overbearing predominance of human dogmas, content to sit as a little child, and learn the attributes and demonstrations of the Godhead from the oracles of revealed wisdom. The question to be tried is less one of doctrine than of fact. The

evidence will be simple and practical, little needing the aid of learned exposition. It will be brought fresh from the gospel mint ; it will carry the stamp of no human hypothesis ; it will not bear the image and superscription of an earth-born Cæsar ; its pure gold will need no purification in the crucible of science. For the result of the verdict we feel no anxiety peculiar to ourselves. We seek truth rather than polemic victory.

If the question between our opponents and ourselves was to be tested by the mere reasonableness of our respective positions, we should confidently expect a decision adverse to the prevalent theory. Divine justice could not pardon mortal sin without full satisfaction. The exchequer of heaven could receive payment in no coin save that of suffering. The second person of the Trinity became himself the great Paymaster. He paid in suffering the debts of the redeemed. Without adequate suffering divine justice was not to be appeased ; without adequate suffering a soul could not be saved. The payment was made in the face of the universe. The glory of the Highest was to be maintained. Heaven was to be satisfied ; hell silenced. The coin was to bear the scrutiny of eternity. The redeeming God lacked not capacity to suffer. Did he, in Godlike gran-

deur, most condescendingly and graciously suffer in his own ethereal essence? or did he, himself untouched by pain, form a redeeming man, destined from his birth to bear, in his frail human nature, the expiatory anguish required at the exchequer of heaven as the price of a world's salvation? To borrow the terms wrought into the major proposition of the Athanasian syllogism, was it most "fitting to God" to save our fallen race by suffering in his own divine essence, or to devolve the whole burden of the vicarious suffering on his created proxy? Was the coin formed of divine, or that composed of human suffering, most acceptable at the celestial treasury, in satisfaction of the lofty requisitions of outraged and inflexible justice?

But we will not farther pursue this train of thought. It might conduct to irreverent speculation. It would seem that even human reason, unless blinded by the hypothesis of divine impassibility, must herself conclude, from her own unbiased reflections, that, in urging the prevalent theory, she is in danger of advocating a dogma derogatory to the disinterestedness and dignity of the Godhead. The question at issue is not, however, to be decided by the mere umpirage of reason. It depends upon scriptural testimony. Reason can do nothing more than collect, and arrange,

and present, and weigh the inspired proofs to be found in the word of God.

We have expressed our belief that our opponents have left the questions of divine impassibility and the exclusive humanity of the mediatorial sufferings substantially where the Athanasian argument left them. We may have been mistaken. Chapters, and even volumes, on the subject may possibly have appeared in some of the languages of earth, dead or living, and yet escaped our circumscribed knowledge. But if we are mistaken, the error, though it must doubtless impeach our theological scholarship, will derogate nothing from the strength of our scriptural argument. The increase of books is almost infinite, multiplying libraries to an extent which casts into the shade the Saracen devastation at Alexandria. With all the "multitudinous" volumes of theological lore, the countless progeny of the unceasing travail of eighteen centuries, there is but one created being that can claim universal familiarity. That being is the worm. It alone, of finite things, has bibliothecal ubiquity. The hugest tomes appal it not. To fastidiousness of taste it is a stranger. It feeds not on the ambrosia of genius alone. Its never-satiated appetite loathes not even the offals of polemical dulness. To rivalry with the worm, in compass of research, we dare not aspire.



Our argument seeks not shelter under the wing of human authority; yet it is satisfactory to find that some few of the best and the wisest have thought as we think. It will readily be perceived that the remarks we are about to quote, and which first reached our knowledge after these sheets were prepared for the press, stand seemingly opposed to the hypothesis of God's impassibility, and to the theory that Christ's sufferings were confined to his manhood.

The first quotation is from the illustrious Chalmers. He says: "It is with great satisfaction that I now clear my way to a topic the most salutary, and, I will add, the most sacramental within the whole compass of revealed faith; even to the love wherewith God so loved the world as to send his Son into it to be the propitiation for our sins. I fear, my brethren, that there is a certain metaphysical notion of the Godhead which blunts our feelings of obligation for all the kindness of his good-will, for all the tenderness of his mercies. There is an academic theology which would divest him of all sensibility; which would make of him a Being devoid of all emotion and all tenderness; which concedes to him power, and wisdom, and a sort of cold, and clear, and faultless morality, but which would denude him of all those fond and fatherly regards that so endear an earthly pa-



rent to the children who have sprung from him. It is thus that God hath been presented to the eye of our imagination as a sort of cheerless and abstract Divinity, who has no sympathy with his creatures, and who, therefore, can have no responding sympathy to him back again. I fear that such representations as these have done mischief in Christianity; that they have had a congealing property in them towards that affection which is represented the most important, and, indeed, the chief attribute of a religious character, even love to God; and that just because of the unloveliness which they throw over the aspect of our Father who is in heaven, whereby men are led to conceive of him as they would of some physical yet tremendous energy, that sitteth aloft in a kind of ungainly and unsocial remoteness from all the felt and familiar humanities of our species. And so it is, we apprehend, that the theism of nature and of science has taken unwarrantable freedoms with the theism of the Bible; attaching a mere figurative sense to all that is spoken there of the various affections of the Deity, and thus despoiling all the exhibitions which it makes of him to our world, of the warmth and power to move and to engage, that properly belong to them. It represents God as altogether impassive; as made up of little more than of understanding and of power; as having no part in that system of

E 2

emotions which occupies so wide a space in the constitution of man, made after his own image and according to his own likeness.”

\* \* \* \* \*

“The Father sent his Son, for our sake, to the humiliation and the agony of a painful sacrifice. There is evident stress laid in the Bible on Jesus Christ being his only Son, and his only beloved Son. This is conceived to enhance the surrender; to aggravate, as it were, the cost of having given up unto the death so near and so dear a relative. In that memorable verse where it is represented that God so loved the world as to send his only begotten Son into it, I bid you mark well the emphasis that lies in the *so*. There was a difference, in respect of painful surrender, between his giving up another, more distantly, as it were, connected with him, and his giving up one who stood to him in such close and affecting relationship. The kin that he hath to Christ is the measure of the love that he manifested to the world, in giving up Christ as the propitiation for the world’s sins. What is this to say but that, in this great and solemn mystery, the Parent was put to the trial of his firmness? that, in the act of doing so, there was a soreness, and a suffering, and a struggle in the bosom of the Divinity? that a something was felt like that which an earthly father

feels when he devotes the best and the dearest of his family to some high object of patriotism? God, in sparing him not, but in giving him up unto the death for us all, sustained a conflict between pity for his child and love for that world for whom he bowed down his head unto the sacrifice. In pouring out the vials of his wrath on the head of his only beloved Son; in awaking the sword of offended justice against his fellow; in laying upon him the whole burden of that propitiation, by which the law could be magnified and its transgressors could be saved; in holding forth on the cross of Christ this blended demonstration of his love and his holiness, and thus enduring the spectacle of his tears and of his agonies and cries till the full atonement was rendered; and not till it was finished did the meek and gentle sufferer give up the ghost. At that time, when angels, looking down from the high battlements of heaven, would have flown to rescue the Son of God from the hands of persecutors, think you that God himself was the only unconcerned and unfeeling spectator? or that, in consenting to these cruel sufferings of his Son for the world, he did not make his love to that world its strongest and most substantial testimony?"\*

\* Chalmers's Lectures on Romans, p. 317, 318. Carter's New York edition.

The next quotation is from the pen of the distinguished Harris, now a living personification of talent, learning, eloquence, and piety in the independent Church of England. He says: "And how does it enhance our conceptions of the divine compassion when we reflect that there is a sense in which the sufferings of Christ were the sufferings of the Father also ! From eternity their divine subsistence in the unity of the Godhead had been only short of identity ; nor could the circumstance of the Saviour's humiliation in the slightest degree relax the bonds of this mutual in-being. While walking the earth in the form of a servant, he could still affirm, ' My Father is in me and I in him '—' I and my Father are one. ' "

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

"The love of God, then, invites our adoration, not only as it at first sent his only begotten Son ; during every moment of the Saviour's sojourn on earth that love was repeating its gift, was making an infinite sacrifice for sinners ; while every pang he endured in the prosecution of his work was the infliction of a wound in the very heart of paternal love. Who, then, shall venture to speak of the appeal which was made to that love, of the trial to which that love was put when the blessed Jesus took into his hand the cup of suffering, when his capacity for suffering was the only limitation

his sufferings knew? If it be true that God is always in vital sympathetic communication with every part of the suffering creation; that, as the sensorium of the universe, he apprehends every emotion, and commiserates every thrill of anguish, how exquisitely must he have felt the filial appeal, when, in the extremity of pain, in the very crisis of his agonizing task, the Saviour cried, ‘My God! my God! why hast thou forsaken me?’”

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

“What a new and amazing insight, then, does it give us into his love for sinners, that it was able to bear the stress of that crisis, that it did not yield and give way to the incalculable power of that appeal! This is a circumstance which, if I may say so, puts into our hands a line, enabling us to fathom his love to an infinite depth; but we find it immeasurably deeper still. It invests the attractions of the cross with augmented power; for in the sufferings of that scene we behold more—if more we are capable of seeing—more even than the love of Christ. In every pang which is there endured we behold the throes of paternal love, the pulsations and tears of infinite compassion; more than the creation in travail, the divine Creator himself travailing in the greatness of infinite love.”\*

\* Harris's Great Teacher, p. 106–108. Humphrey's Amherst edit.

The Christ of the Bible was that "Holy Thing," born of the Virgin, and conceived by the power of the Holy Ghost. He who begat him imparted to the infant God the distinctive appellation of the Christ. The elements composing this unique and august Being were the human nature of his virgin mother, corporeal and intellectual, and the ethereal essence of the second person of the Trinity. His divine and human natures remained distinct, notwithstanding their union. They were united, not commingled. The name, the Christ, was not an unmeaning appellative; it was at once comprehensive and descriptive; pointing significantly to its absorbing centre, the mysterious and awful union of his manhood and his Godhead. To this illustrious personage other names are given in the New Testament. He is there called not only Christ, but also Jesus, Christ Jesus, Jesus Christ, the Son of Man, the Son of God, the Word, and the Lamb of God. All these appellatives are identical in their meaning with the name, the Christ. They are but its synonymes.

Our translators should always have prefixed to the name of Christ the definite article. It belonged there. He was not only Messiah, but the Messiah; not only Anointed, but the Anointed; not merely Christ, but the Christ. To the name of the Voice that cried in the wilderness they have

almost invariably prefixed the article. In every instance but one they have rendered the name, not John Baptist, but John the Baptist. This is as it should have been. The article gives to the name its proper significance and force. The prefixion of the definite article should no more have been omitted in the case of Christ than in that of his precursor. The translators have saved a short word. It was not true economy. They lost in meaning more than they gained in brevity.

From the numerous scriptural passages declarative of the sufferings of Christ, we have selected the following: "Before I" (Christ) "suffer."—Luke, xii., 15. "Ought not Christ to have suffered?"—Luke, xxiv., 26. "Thus it behooved Christ to suffer."—Luke, xxiv., 46. God before showed "that Christ should suffer."—Acts, iii., 18. "Opening and alleging that Christ must needs have suffered."—Acts, xvii., 3. "That Christ should suffer, and that he should be the first that should rise from the dead."—Acts, xxvi., 23. "If so be that we suffer with him" (Christ).—Romans, viii., 17. "For even Christ our passover is sacrificed for us."—1 Corinthians, v., 7. "For as the sufferings of Christ abound in us."—2 Corinthians, i., 5. "For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin."—2 Corinthians, v., 21. "And the life which I now live in the flesh, I live by the faith



of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me.”—Galatians, ii., 20. “Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us.”—Galatians, iii., 13. “As Christ also hath loved us, and hath given himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God.”—Ephesians, v., 2. “Even as Christ also loved the Church, and gave himself for it.”—Ephesians, v., 25. “That I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings.”—Philippians, iii., 10. “To make the Captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings.”—Hebrews, ii., 10. “For in that he himself” (Christ) “hath suffered, being tempted.”—Hebrews, ii., 18. “Though he were a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered.”—Hebrews, v., 8. “For then must he” (Christ) “often have suffered since the foundation of the world.”—Hebrews, ix., 26. “Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate.”—Hebrews, xiii., 20. “When it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ.”—1 Peter, i., 11. “Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example.”—1 Peter, ii., 21. “When he” (Christ) “suffered, he threatened not.”—1 Peter, ii., 23. “Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree.”—1 Peter, ii., 24. “For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust.”—1 Peter, iii., 18. “Foras-



much, then, as Christ hath suffered for us in the flesh.”—1 Peter, iv., 1. “As ye are partakers of Christ’s sufferings.”—1 Peter, iv., 13. “Who am also an elder, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ.”—1 Peter, v., 1.

F

## CHAPTER V.

Name of Christ—Its Compass and Power—Scriptural Language, how to be construed—Name includes both his Natures—Any Exceptions are created and explained by the Bible—No such Exception intimated in Case of his Sufferings—Christ's own Declarations, Luke, xxiv., 26, 46—His Name denotes Totality of his united Being, not one of its Parts—Union of his two Natures constituted holy Partnership, to which his Name was given—Name not applicable to the exclusive Suffering of the human Partner.

THE abounding scriptural declarations of the sufferings of Christ, just presented to the reader, are general and unqualified, without limit or exception. They cover all the consecrated ground covered by the name of the Christ. The reader has already learned that the name, the Christ, was imparted by the Holy Ghost to the infant Jesus, to designate his mysterious union of humanity with the Godhead. The name was commensurate with the infinitude of his united being. The limits and power of that redeeming, yet awful name, will be the theme of the present chapter. We shall attempt to show that, when applied by Scripture to the mediatorial sacrifice, the name itself, in its distinctive and wide-reaching signification, necessarily imports, *ex vi termini*, or from its own intrinsic compass and potency, the participation of both Christ's natures in his expiatory sufferings.

It must constantly be borne in mind, that what distinguished Christ from all other beings in the universe was his union of the divine and human natures. Earth teems with men, and the celestial throne sustains two other persons of the Godhead ; but the unique phenomenon of a being, at once God and man, was first exhibited in the manger of Bethlehem, where it received, from the Holy Ghost, its distinctive appellation. It cannot be denied that the name, the Christ, and each of its equivalents, ordinarily includes both his natures. It must be admitted that, as a general rule, the term can only be satisfied by its application to his two natures unitedly ; that the two natures are its natural aliment ; that the name is crippled by confining it to his humanity alone ; that his two natures are the divine and human pedestals on which this glorious name reposes in all the infinitude of its meaning.

The science of construing words, written and spoken, has been matured by the united wisdom of centuries. It is the use of words which elevates man above the brute, and on their just and uniform construction depend the stability and safety of all the transactions of social life. Of this useful science, the most simple, universal, and controlling axiom is its elemental rule, that words are to be construed *according to their plain, obvious,*

*and ordinary import.* No metaphysical subtilities are to make fluctuating the standard of speech. On this rule depends the security of deeds, the most important documents known in the private intercourse of living men; on this rule rests the sanctity of those hallowed bequests which come to us as voices from the dead; even legislative enactments lose all their value, and become dangerous snares when the inviolability of this cardinal rule is wantonly invaded.

This elemental axiom is, as it were, the human palladium of the oracles of revealed truth. That document, written by the hand of God to enlighten the common mind, should be ever meekly received by the children of men, according to the plain, obvious, and ordinary meaning of its sacred words. Its language is brief, simple, clear; well suited, if left unobscured by construction, to the level of ordinary understandings. Its phraseology was selected by the Holy Ghost, as best calculated to bring home even to the closets of uneducated piety the precepts and consolations of inspired wisdom in all their purity and force. It is the call of their heavenly Father to the lost and wandering sons and daughters of humanity. It has all the tenderness, and simplicity, and plainness of the parental voice. Unless clouded by human interpretation,

it well knows how to wind its way into the inmost recesses of the filial heart.

The words of scripture should be understood by us in the same manner as they were calculated to be understood by those to whom they were originally addressed. We are to receive them according to their apparent signification, not to hunt after some occult meaning. If they startle us by their loftiness of import, we must remember that they are the words of the unsearchable God. If they are "as high as heaven," we have no right to drag them rudely down to earth. To pursue the imagined spirit of a passage, in opposition to its plain letter, is an experiment that man should make with fear and trembling. He may, unwittingly, "add unto," or "take away from" that holy book which came down from above. Let him beware of the penalties denounced at the close of the last chapter of the New Testament—Revelation, xxii., 18, 19.

If the scriptural passages declarative of the sufferings of Christ are taken in their plain, obvious, and ordinary sense, they include, beyond peradventure, his divine nature as well as his humanity. The name of Christ is used by the inspired writers to indicate the length, and breadth, and height, and depth of his sufferings; and that name,

in its ordinary import, has no limits narrower than the whole compass of his united natures. Let a man of ordinary understanding, candid and intelligent, untinged by the unfounded hypothesis of God's impassibility, open his Bible; let him read there the oft-repeated, general, and unqualified declarations that Christ suffered; let him call to mind the peculiarity of Christ's being, uniting in himself the God and the man, and that this union, in all the elements of both its natures, is pervaded and represented by his distinctive appellation, and the inference seems to be inevitable, that he would come to the conclusion that the sufferings of Christ were as extensive as the import of his holy name. It doubtless would not occur to this plain and unbiassed reader of the Bible that he was at liberty to narrow down, by his own fiat, to a particular and contracted meaning, declarations and words which the Holy Ghost left general and unlimited.

It is true that a few insulated cases are to be found in scripture where words expressive of Christ are applied peculiarly to his human nature. It is on this ground, as it would seem, that the advocates of the prevalent theory seek to bring under the same category the general and abounding scriptural declarations of his sufferings. We might reply that, in these few insulated cases, the distinctive name of Christ is almost never used; but

we prefer to place our reply on more general grounds. We have, at some pains, ascertained the number of times that the name of Christ, in some of its forms, appears in the New Testament, and find it to be sixteen hundred and twenty-five. The insulated cases in which either of his names, or its equivalent, is used to designate his human nature exclusively cannot exceed one in a hundred of this number.

These insulated cases are so rare in their occurrence and so uncertain in their import as scarcely to amount to an exception to the general scriptural rule, that the name of Christ denotes both of his united natures. And in all these insulated cases the limitation of his name to his human nature is rendered inevitable by intrinsic marks on the passages themselves, or by contiguous portions of holy writ. Take, as a sample, the declaration of Christ, "My Father is greater than I."—John, xiv., 28. The declaration was limited to his humanity by our Lord himself, when he said, a few chapters before, "I and my Father are one."—John, x., 30. Take another sample: "But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels of heaven, but my Father only."—Matthew, xxiv., 36. This lack of prescience is necessarily confined to his human nature by numerous other passages of the New Testament, which im-

ply that, as the second person of the Trinity, his omniscient eye scans at a glance the illimitable expanse of the future. So that, in these insulated cases, it is God, and not man, who limits to the humanity of Christ a name naturally including both his natures within its expressive import. The Bible itself explains the excepted passages; the Bible still stands its own expositor; it is not human reason that ingrafts the particular limitation on the general language of holy writ.

The name, the Christ, when mingled in the ever-recurring declarations of his sufferings, is not thus limited to his humanity, directly or by implication, anywhere in the Word of God. The limitation sought to be ingrafted on the declarations of his sufferings rests on human, not on divine authority. It is the begotten of the unfounded hypothesis, "God is impassible." Had that hypothesis never been adopted, it is not likely that the prevalent theory, confining the sufferings of Christ to his human nature, would have found a place in Christian theology.

Human reason has no authority delegated from above to restrict, by its own volition, what the Bible has left general. The Word of God must not be bent to what human reason somewhat arrogantly terms, when applied to divine things, its



own sound discretion. The sound discretion of one theorist differs from the sound discretion of another theorist. If the Bible is to shape itself to the ever-varying phases of what claims to be the sound discretion of reason, it must assume more forms than the fabled Proteus of heathen mythology ever assumed. The self-styled sound discretion of human reason has done the Bible more harm than it ever suffered from the prince of darkness. It has brought Christians into collision with Christians ; it has broken into fragments what should have been the one and indivisible Church of the Son of God ; it has rent asunder what the Roman soldiery spared, even the seamless vestment of Christ.

The impropriety of limiting to his mere humanity the unlimited declarations of scripture indicative of Christ's sufferings will be more obvious if we consider the relative proportions which his two natures bore to each other. The one was finite, the other was infinite. His humanity was not only the inferior nature, but it was, as it were, absorbed and lost in the boundless expansion of the divine. Would the inspired writers, would our Lord himself, then, if intending to have it believed that the divinity of Christ had not suffered, have used, to express the sufferings of his mere terrestrial adjunct, terms applicable to the whole

infinitude of his united natures ; and terms, too, which are crippled and distorted by a more limited application ? They best knew the natures and agonies of the Mediator ; and when they used the significant term, the Christ, to designate the recipient of the expiatory sufferings, they must have meant that the Christ, the whole Christ of the Bible had suffered.

When you speak of the visible heavens, in terms broad and unlimited, you cannot be supposed to have lost sight of the blue expanse and the glorious sun above you ; and your words, appropriate and suited to the whole majestic scene, and to that only, should not be narrowed, by mere construction, to the frail cloud that specks the skirt of the horizon. If these inspired writers, if our Saviour himself had intended to declare that the atoning sufferings of Christ were confined to his mere earthly appendage ; if they had designed to limit the generality of their words to so restricted and confined a meaning, they would have said so in terms, or, at least, by necessary implication. There is no self-contracting power in the words indicative of suffering to draw within creature dimensions a name framed by the Holy Ghost to include within its vast compass not only the finite man, but the infinite God.

When our Lord, after his resurrection, asserted his sufferings interrogatively, "Ought not Christ to have suffered?" when, in a subsequent verse of the same chapter, he repeated the assertion positively, "Thus it behooved Christ to suffer;" when he thus, without restriction, used the very name which he had himself adopted to designate his united natures, can erring man venture to say that by that name he intended to designate one of his natures only as the recipient of his suffering, and that, too, the inferior one?—Luke, xxiv., 26, 46. The Son of God did not say, interrogatively or positively, that Christ ought to have suffered, or that it behooved him to suffer in his human nature only. It is reasoning pride which seeks virtually to interpolate into the sacred texts the omitted words, "in his human nature only," by its own uninspired interpretation.

How can worms of the dust presume to limit, by such words of addition and restriction, the unlimited and unrestricted declarations of the infinite Son; lowering, too, the majesty of the declarations, as it were, from heaven down to earth? We are bound to give unqualified credence to what Christ unqualifiedly uttered. It would ill become us to suppose that he spoke unadvisedly. He best knew that, while in a subordinate sense he was man, he was God in the primary and prin-

principal elements of his being. He perfectly understood that the name of that God-man, of his own glorious self, was Christ. When he used his own distinctive name, without restriction or limitation, his meaning must have had all the compass which that name imports. When he twice declared in the same chapter that Christ had suffered, without restriction or limitation, he must be understood to have included both the natures indicated by the name of Christ, and to have affirmed that the whole Christ had suffered.

The distinctive name, the Christ, was the name of the totality of his person. It was not given to either of his two natures, but to their union; it was the name of the whole, not of its parts. It is ordinarily no more used in scripture to signify one of his united natures than the name circle is used in mathematics to signify one of the segments of which it is composed. Whenever the term Christ is used in scripture, save in a very few insulated cases, scarcely amounting to an exception, it was intended to be applied to both his natures unitedly. When, therefore, the Bible so often declared that Christ suffered, it meant to declare that he suffered in his united natures. Suffering in his human nature would have been the suffering of the human son of the Virgin; suffering in the divine nature would have been the suf-

fering of the second person of the Trinity ; but in neither case would the suffering have been the suffering of Christ.

God formed the first Adam "of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life." The creature thus formed was compounded of body and soul. To this complex being, and to his posterity, the appellation of man was given by his Almighty Creator. The name pertains not exclusively to his soul or to his body, but to their mysterious union. It would be an unintelligible abuse of the name to apply it separately either to his corporeal or to his spiritual nature. It belongs to the united totality of the man.

To the second Adam, combining in himself divinity and humanity, the distinctive appellation of Christ was imparted by the Holy Ghost, to designate, not one of his united natures singly, but their glorious union. The name of Christ was as exclusively appropriated to his united being as the name of man was appropriated to the united body and soul of the first Adam. The name of Christ, when used without explanation, can no more be limited to his human nature than the name of man, when used without explanation, can be limited to the human body. The few insulated cases where the name of Christ is applied, in scripture, to his

manhood alone, have in or about them abundant scriptural explanations. Where the Bible has recorded no limiting explanation, we are bound to suppose that it intended to affix to the sacred name the same plenitude of meaning affixed to it by the Holy Ghost when it was originally imparted to the infant Saviour. The abounding scriptural declarations of the sufferings of Christ are limited to his manhood by no scriptural explanations. They stand, therefore, clothed in the same amplitude of signification that was attached to the consecrated name by the Holy Ghost in the manger of Bethlehem.

The Bible is wont to express heavenly things by earthly similitudes. Sustained by this example, we would venture most reverentially to suggest that, by the incarnation, the second person of the Trinity received into a holy partnership with himself the human son of Mary. The union had for its object the salvation of a world. To that sacred union a distinctive name was given. The name of the holy partnership was the Christ. It commenced in the womb of the Virgin; its duration was to be without end; its members were once wrapped together in the swaddling clothes of the manger; they now occupy the right hand throne of heaven. Both retained, in unmingled perfection, their own distinct natures; they differ-

ed infinitely in dignity : the one was a worm of the dust ; the other was the Lord of Glory.

According to the prevalent theory, the man, in his own distinct nature, suffered, while the God remained wholly free from suffering. Now we submit it as a clear proposition, that, under this theory, the individual and insulated sufferings of the terrestrial partner were not the sufferings of the holy union ; that they were not distinguishable by its partnership appellation ; and that they could not, without violating the elemental principles of speech, have been called the sufferings of Christ. Under the prevalent theory, the holy union suffered not. Its name, then, would not have been employed by inspiration to designate the suffering. Its sacred name was consecrated to the holy union. If the name has, in a very few insulated cases, been depressed to the man, it was the Bible that did it ; and the Bible was not only the author, but the ample expositor of the depression. The Bible contains no intimation, direct or indirect, of any such depression of the name of Christ, when applied to his sufferings. There was none. His sufferings were the sufferings of the holy union in both its natures.

A partnership of earth, whether commercial, professional, agricultural, or literary, cannot be



said to suffer from an injury to one of the individual partners, in his separate and distinct capacity, in no wise affecting the association. The partnership can only be said to suffer when the injury is felt by all its partners actually, and not merely by sympathy. To apply the partnership name to an injury borne by an individual partner exclusively would be a palpable misuse of the term. So, if in the holy union designated by the name of Christ, the man had been the sole sufferer, his individual suffering would not have been expressed by the name dedicated to the holy union. Such an appropriation would have been a misapplication of the sacred name of which the inspired writers were utterly incapable.



## CHAPTER VI.

Phrase, the Person of Christ—Means nothing more than simple Name, the Christ—No Analogy between Person of Christ suffering from Pains of Human Nature and Person of ordinary Man suffering from corporeal Pains—Bishop Pearson again considered—Bishop Beveridge considered—Godhead of Christ suffered actually, not merely by construction—If Christ suffered only in Humanity, his Sufferings, taken in reference to his Divine Beatitude were inconceivably small.

THE phrase, the person of Christ, holds a conspicuous place in Christian theology, and is intimately connected with our subject. The union of his two natures constitutes what is termed the person of Christ; and it is supposed by our opponents that, from the suffering of either of his united natures, his person would be said to suffer. Hence it is argued that the scriptural declarations affirming that Christ suffered, in general and unrestricted terms, had abundant aliment in the suffering of his manhood alone. This is the citadel, claiming impregnable strength, in which the advocates of the prevalent theory have intrenched themselves; it requires, therefore, to be accurately examined.

It is believed that the phrase, the person of Christ, is found but once in the translation of the

New Testament, 2 Corinthians, ii., 10. The verse in the translation reads thus : "To whom ye forgive anything, I forgive also ; for if I forgave anything, to whom I forgave it, for your sakes forgave I it in the person of Christ." The best commentators think that this passage is incorrectly translated, and that the original Greek words rendered "in the person of Christ" should have been rendered "in the name and by the authority of Christ." So thought Macknight, and other commentators agree with him.

But it would be useless to pursue the inquiry whether the phrase, the person of Christ, is of divine or human origin. Whatever its origin may be, the phrase has no greater amplitude of meaning than the simple scriptural name, the Christ. The name expresses the union of the divine and human natures ; the phrase expresses nothing more. Christ and the person of Christ are synonymous. Should theology seek to clothe the phrase with a wider meaning than belongs to the simple name, the extension must be wrought out by the artificial process of human reasoning. On such extension no true theory of Christian faith can repose. None can object to the use of the phrase as a convenient synonyme for the name of Christ ; we may ourselves use it for that purpose in these sheets ; beyond that its use is not

sanctioned by scriptural authority. The name itself imports the union of the Godhead and the manhood ; the phrase can legitimately import nothing more.

It has been urged, that as the union of his two natures forms the person of Christ, in the same way as the union of the soul and body of an ordinary man forms the person of that man, so the numerous passages of scripture declarative of Christ's sufferings are all satisfied by his having suffered in his humanity, in the same manner as an ordinary person is said to suffer, though his pains are corporeal. It is not within our province to complain of the comparison between the person of Christ, composed of his two natures, and the person of an ordinary man, composed of his body and soul, when used for purposes of general illustration ; but when applied to Christ's expiatory agonies, and urged to satisfy, by the suffering of his mere manhood, the oft-repeated declarations of scripture, averring his sufferings in terms which, according to their natural and plain import, would make them pervade every recess of his united being, nothing can be more fallacious and misleading than this very comparison.

The person of an ordinary man is said to suffer from corporeal pains, because corporeal pains af-

fect his whole united being. If any one doubts whether an ailment of the body communicates itself to the mind, let the skeptic attempt some intellectual effort with a raging toothache, or with a limb writhing under the agonies of the gout. So, mental suffering, when intense or protracted, affects the body. The disease of a broken heart, though it may find no place on the bills of mortality, has, nevertheless, many victims.

But if there was no sympathetic link between the human soul and her humble sister; if she stood impregnable in her impassibility; if she was cased in armour of proof less penetrable than the fabled armour of the Grecian hero; if she felt the ailments of her encircling flesh no more than the body feels the rents of the garments which it wears, then, indeed, the local pains of the outer man could not be ranked under the denomination of the suffering of his person. The chief element of his person is the immortal, priceless spirit within. Should that continue to bask in the sunshine of bliss, untouched by the local ailments of his mere body, those ailments would be classed under some more limited and humble appellation than that of the suffering of his person. A part of a person is not the person. This position is based on the elemental principle that a part is not the whole. The foot is not the person, though

forming one of its integral parts. Any ailment of the foot, unless it generally affected the person, could not be denominated the suffering of the person.

If we are at liberty to suppose that, by the laws of his united being, the agonies of Christ's human nature pervaded and affected his divine essence also, then, and then only, would any similitude exist between the person of Christ suffering from his human anguish, and the person of an ordinary man suffering from corporeal pain. But the very corner-stone of the prevalent theory rests on the supposition that the anguish of Christ's human nature did not affect the divine; that while the man Christ Jesus was writhing under agonies unparalleled in the annals of profane or sacred story, the God Christ Jesus was untouched by pain; that his beatitude was as perfect at Gethsemane, and on the cross, as it had been when, in his presence, "the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy," to celebrate the birth of the new world which he had just brought into being. Job, xxxviii., 7.

If the Godhead of Christ, cased in everlasting impassibility, participated not in the agonies of his manhood, then the supposed analogy between the person of an ordinary man suffering from his

corporeal pains, and the person of Christ suffering from the pains of his human nature, utterly fails. The manhood of Christ was but an insulated atom in the infinitude of his being. The local and incommunicable pains of that insulated atom would have been termed the sufferings of the person of Christ, no more than the rippling of some small and sequestered bay would be denominated the commotion of the mighty ocean to which it is joined. The Godhead of Christ was the infinite constituent of his person. While his Godhead retained in full perfection its primeval and ineffable beatitude, suffering would not have been predicated of the person of Christ. The insulated pangs of his manhood would rather have been denominated the sufferings of his terrestrial adjunct, than the sufferings of the august person of the incarnate Deity. Upon the prevalent theory, the little rivulet of human wo, bitter, indeed, and dark, as it could not have ruffled or discoloured, so it would not have given its melancholy name to the peaceful, illimitable, and heavenly sea of divine felicity which formed the predominating, the almost absorbing element of the person of the God "manifest in the flesh."

Many other corollaries have been drawn from the phrase, the person of Christ, by the advocates of the prevalent theory. A few of these corolla-

ries will be noticed here, even at the hazard of a partial anticipation of some future branches of our argument. It will hereafter appear that the Bible, in addition to its application of the name of Christ to the redeeming sufferer, virtually asserts, in various other forms, that the second person of the Trinity suffered for the salvation of the world. All these intimations of scripture are sought to be neutralized by the mysterious potency of the phrase, the person of Christ.

Bishop Pearson and Bishop Beveridge, and other advocates of the prevalent theory, have ingeniously urged, that, from the intimate connexion of the divine and human natures in the person of Christ, the God became constructively man, and the man constructively God; and that, therefore, the Bible, in virtually declaring that the second person of the Trinity suffered and died, meant nothing more than to declare that the impassible God constructively suffered and died in the suffering and death of the passible man.

The words of Bishop Pearson are as follows: "And now the only difficulty will consist in this, how we can reconcile the person suffering with the subject of his passion; how we can say that God did suffer, when we profess the Godhead suffered not. But this seeming difficulty will admit



an easy solution, if we consider the intimate conjunction of the divine and human nature, and their union in the person of the Son. For hereby those attributes which properly belong to the one are given to the other, and that upon good reason ; for seeing the same individual person is, by the conjunction of the nature of God and the nature of man, really and truly both God and man, it necessarily followeth that it is true to say *God is man*, and as true, *a man is God* ; because, in this particular, he which is man is God, and he which is God is man.”\*

The words of Bishop Beveridge are as follows : “ When he died, God himself may be truly said to have laid down his life ; for so his beloved disciple saith expressly : ‘ Hereby we perceive the love of God, because he laid down his life for us.’—1 John, iii., 16. Strange expressions ! Yet not so strange as true, as being uttered by truth itself. Neither will they seem strange unto us, if we truly believe, and consider that he who suffered all this was and is both God and man ; not in two distinct persons, as if he was one person as God, and another person as man, according to the Nestorian heresy ; for if so, then his sufferings as man would have been of no value for us, nor have stood us in any stead, as being the sufferings only of a

\* Pearson on the Creed, p. 313, 314.



finite person ; but he is both God and man in one and the same person, as the third general council declared out of the Holy Scriptures, and the Catholic Church always believed. From whence it comes to pass, that, although his sufferings affected only the manhood, yet that, being at the same time united to the Godhead in one and the same person, they therefore were, and may be properly called the sufferings of God himself ; the person that suffered them being really and truly God.”\*

With profound respect for these learned and pious prelates, we cannot but regard their distinctions as too subtle, too involved, too metaphysical for gospel simplicity. We must humbly protest against the startling dogmas, that, by virtue of the union of the two natures in the person of Christ, “those attributes which properly belong to the one are given to the other,” and “that it is true to say, *God is man*, and as true, *a man is God*.” The Bible’s great Mediator himself taught the infinite distinction between his manhood and his Godhead, notwithstanding their union. “My Father is greater than I.”—John, xiv., 28. “Why callest thou me good ? there is none good but one ; that is God.”—Matthew, xix., 17. “But to sit on my right hand and on my left is not mine to give, but

\* Beveridge’s Sermons, vol. i., p. 128.

it shall be given to them for whom it is prepared of my Father.”—Matthew, xx., 23. “But of that day and that hour knoweth no man; no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the son, but the Father.”—Mark, xiii., 32. Thus it appears, from the highest authority in the universe, that, notwithstanding the union of the two natures in the person of Christ, the man did not become God, or assume the divine attributes. Nor did the God sink into the man. Christ recognised, in his divine capacity, no inferiority to the Father, either in power, or goodness, or prescience.

The manhood of Christ, then, was not God. The sufferings of his manhood were not the sufferings of the Deity. The man did not become constructively God; nor were the sufferings of his manhood constructively the sufferings of the Deity. If the God was impassive, and the man only suffered, his human sufferings touched not the Godhead. The Bible would not have styled them the sufferings of the Godhead. God the Son suffered not by proxy. He could no more have suffered by proxy than he could have become incarnate by proxy. If the God suffered not in his ethereal essence, the scriptural declarations of his sufferings are not true, in the amplitude of scriptural verity. The Bible says nothing of suffering by construction. The thought is not to be found

in Holy Writ. It is the imagination of the prevalent theory. The Son of God suffered not constructively, any more than he formed the worlds constructively. There is nothing constructive, or merely seeming, in the actions of the Holy Trinity.

If, according to the prevalent hypothesis and theory, the divine nature is, by its own inherent laws, necessarily wrapped in everlasting impassibility ; if eternal and infinite beatitude belongs to it as an inseparable incident, whether it so wills or not, then the term suffering could, under no possible circumstances, have been applied by scripture to a person of the Godhead, whether standing by himself in unapproached glory, or united to an inferior nature. Impassibility and suffering are opposites, as much as light and darkness. They are, in respect to each other, foreign and incommunicable properties. Suffering cannot be infused into impassibility by the closest proximity or the most intimate union. If the God had been really impassive, the suffering of the man could no more have been infused into the impassible God by construction than the salt of the ocean could be constructively infused into the diamond which its waves have ingulfed. Suffering could no more be predicated of an infinitely impassible God, than sin could be predicated of

an infinitely holy God. Suffering is as much opposed to the inherent laws of impassibility as sin is opposed to the inherent laws of holiness.

Upon the prevalent theory and its parent hypothesis, the beloved disciple could no more have been taught by inspiration to say, as he did in truth say in the passage quoted from one of his epistles by Bishop Beveridge himself, "Hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life for us," than he would have been taught by inspiration to say, that the infinitely Holy God committed some flagrant sin for the redemption of the world. He might have declared that the man united to the God, or the man whose body was the shrine of the God, had "laid down his life for us." But the inspired writer could not, if the prevalent theory and its parent hypothesis are true, have declared that the eternally impassible God had "laid down his life for us;" for that would have been declaring that the eternally impassible God had violated the immutable laws of his own infinite being. It would have been the assertion of a moral, perhaps physical impossibility, and the presumptuous application of such assertion to the awful majesty of the Godhead.

The supposition that St. John, and his inspired brethren of the New Testament, when they so

often declared that God the Son suffered to save our sinking race, meant only to indicate the sufferings of the man, and to affirm that the human suffering became the suffering of the God by construction, is a gratuitous assumption of the advocates of the prevalent theory. The inspired declarations are numerous and unequivocal. They are couched in simple and plain terms. They include, within their fair purport and compass, the divine as well as the human nature of the person of Christ. There is not the slightest reason for supposing that the Holy Ghost meant differently from what he has graciously said. It is the prevalent theory, and not the Bible, which affirms that the man suffered actually, and the God only constructively.

We have thus followed, through several of its varying aspects, the argument of our learned and pious opponents, derived from the phrase, the person of Christ; a phrase deemed by them competent to satisfy not only the abounding averments of the Bible that Christ suffered, but also the affirmation that God "laid down his life for us," and various other like scriptural declarations, indicating that the second person of the Trinity actually suffered for the redemption of the world. We now propose to bring this far-reaching and high-soaring argument of the prevalent theory to another test.

Christ combined in holy union the human son of the Virgin, and he who, from everlasting, had filled the right-hand seat of the omnipotent throne. This holy union our opponents love to designate by the phrase, the person of Christ. The person of Christ, then, combined the finite man and the infinite God. The union of the manhood and the Godhood was complete and indissoluble. Time never for a moment severed it on earth; nor will eternity ever sever it in heaven. The prevalent theory affirms that into this holy union the God carried his own primeval felicity, and that it remained, in unimpaired perfection, during every hour of his terrestrial sojourn. According to this theory, the person of Christ enclosed in its bosom, from the manger of Bethlehem to the tomb of Joseph, the ineffable felicity of the blessed God. The theory, of course, holds that the person of Christ suffered, not by the suffering of his whole person, but by that of his manhood alone.

Suffering consists in the diminution of what would otherwise have been the happiness of the sufferer. The amount of the suffering is tested by the amount of such diminution. In the case under consideration, the person of Christ was the sufferer. What, then, was the diminution of the felicity of the person of Christ, caused by the mere suffering of his manhood? We have no

weight or measure to ascertain it; but brief reflection will teach us that it must have been inconceivably small. The happiness of the person of Christ, if his divinity tasted not of suffering, was infinite. It embraced the plenitude of the felicity of the Godhead. According to the prevalent theory, the suffering of the person of Christ was finite. It consisted in the suffering of the man alone. Subtract finite suffering from infinite beatitude, and the diminution will be too small for the most microscopic vision. Heavy as no doubt were the sufferings of Christ's humanity, when estimated by an earthly standard, they must have been comparatively light when taken in reference to the person of him "who hath measured the waters in the hollow of his hand," and "taketh up the isles as a very little thing."—Isaiah, xl., 12, 15. The bitter stream of human wo must have been absorbed and lost in the illimitable ocean of divine felicity.

If you subtract a single grain of sand from the globe we inhabit, arithmetic can perceive, and perhaps estimate the diminution; but the subtraction of the suffering of the finite man from the felicity of the person of Christ, embracing the full beatitude of the infinite God, would have caused a diminution of bliss too small for creature perception. Doubtless the ken of an archangel could not



have perceived it. The happiness of the person of Christ, subject to his human suffering, must have been incalculably greater even at Gethsemane and Calvary, if the God suffered not in his ethereal essence, than the happiness of any other person who ever dwelt in this lower world, including the days of Eden. It must have surpassed the felicity of any other being in the universe, save that of the Father and the Holy Ghost. The minute atom of his human suffering, compared with the mighty totality of his divine beatitude, was less than the scarcely perceptible speck that often passes over without obscuring the orb of day.

Yet the Bible everywhere darkly shadows forth the sufferings of Christ, or, if our opponents prefer the phrase, the sufferings of the person of Christ, as having been too intense and vast for even inspiration intelligibly to express in mortal language. The dimly portrayed sufferings darkened the face of day ; they convulsed the earth ; they must have wrung tears from heavenly eyes ; they shook, well-nigh to dissolution, the person of the incarnate God. And was it, indeed, the mere finite suffering of Christ's humanity, bearing a less proportion to the totality of his infinite bliss than the glow-worm bears to the luminary of our system, that the Bible thus labours, and labours, as it were, in vain, adequately to express to mortal ears ? No !



The sufferings, in the delineation of which even inspiration seems to falter, were not limited to the finite, but pervaded also the most sacred recesses of that infinite essence which went to constitute the holy union, styled by our opponents the person of Christ. The sufferings of the man lay within the limits of scriptural delineation. The agonies of the God none but a God could conceive. Perhaps even Omnipotence could not make them intelligible to creature apprehension.

The theory which holds that the suffering element in the person of Christ was only the little speck of his humanity, with the inference to which it inevitably leads of the minuteness of the subtraction from the bliss of his united person caused by the suffering of that human speck, cannot but detract immeasurably from the dignity and glory of the atonement. It sinks the expiatory sufferings of the person of Christ from their scriptural infinitude down to a point too small for mortal, doubtless too small for angelic vision.

The position that, of the two natures united in the person of Christ, the one suffered and the other never tasted of suffering; that the one was filled to overflowing with unutterable anguish, and the other with inconceivable joy; that the one drank to its dregs "the cup of trembling," while the oth-

er was quaffing the ocean of more than seraphic beatitude, can derive no support from human reason. Such a theory, tending, as it does in no small degree, to augment "the mystery of Godliness," required plenary scriptural proof for its support. Its advocates have not furnished such proof. In the face of the Christian world, we affectionately, yet solemnly invoke its production, if to be found in the Word of God.

## CHAPTER VII.

Natures of Christ concurred and participated in all his Sayings and Doings—So in Heaven and on Earth—All his Sayings and Doings were in his Mediatorial Character, requiring Concurrence and Participation of United Natures—No Exception in Article of Suffering—Examples of Concurrence and Participation—Farther Examples, in case of Miracles—Moanings on Cross in United Natures—Mediation a Suffering Mediation—Eternal Son “emptied himself” of his Beatitude as well as Glory on becoming incarnate.

THE concurrence and participation of the divine and human natures of Christ, according to the measure of their respective capacities, in all his sayings and doings, is a doctrine fairly deducible from the Word of God. The elucidation of this great truth will be the object of the present chapter.

The concurrence and participation of the two natures of Christ in all his sayings and doings subsequent to his resurrection and ascension will not be disputed. The man ascended with the God to heaven ; he is seated with the God at the right hand of the Highest ; he will come with the God, in the clouds of heaven, to judge the world in righteousness. The stupendous words closing the mediatorial drama, “Come, ye blessed,” and “Depart from me, ye cursed,” will be pronounced by those very lips from whence proceeded that

never-to-be-forgotten sermon on the mount, so fraught with fearful truths, so abounding in gracious benedictions. It would have seemed a strange anomaly, if there had not existed the like concurrence and participation of the divine and human natures of the incarnate God in all the sayings and doings of his earthly pilgrimage.

No such anomaly is indicated by the Word of God. On the contrary, it is a clear inference from holy writ that the two natures of Christ concurred and participated, according to the measure of their respective capacities, in all his sayings and doings, from his birth in the manger until the "cloud received him" out of the sight of his steadfastly-gazing disciples.

The terrestrial sojourn of the second person of the Trinity, clothed in flesh, was wholly mediatorial. It was the discharge of the arduous duties of his mediatorial office that called him down to earth and detained him there. When its terrestrial duties were done he re-ascended to his native heavens. In the structure of the mediatorial office, the constituent elements were divinity and manhood. The concurrence and participation of both these elements were indispensable. Had the Godhead withdrawn its full concurrence and participation, the mediatorial work must have stood still, as did

once the sun on Gibeon. The prevalent theory will not deny our general position ; but it seeks to carve out an exception in the article of suffering. The exception can find no scriptural passage whereon to rest the sole of its foot. The Bible everywhere speaks of the second person of the Trinity, arrayed in manhood, not only as an incarnate, but also as a suffering Mediator.

We have seen that the name of Christ, in some one of its synonymes, occurs sixteen hundred and twenty-five times in the New Testament. The name is to be found eight hundred and thirty-one times in the four gospels, and seven hundred and ninety-four between the end of the gospels and the close of Revelation. In no one of these sixteen hundred and twenty-five instances is there the slightest intimation that, from the general rule requiring the concurrence and participation of the two natures of Christ in all his mediatorial sayings and doings, there was an exception carved out in the article of suffering. The omission could not have occurred sixteen hundred and twenty-five times by accident or inadvertence. It was the Holy Ghost who spoke ; and he spoke to settle the landmarks of human faith. This ominous omission spontaneously multiplies itself into sixteen hundred and twenty-five scriptural arguments against the existence of the alleged exception.

The redeeming God and the redeeming man were born together. They spent together the long interval between infancy and manhood. At the maturity of the man, they together began and continued to preach glad tidings to the poor; they went about in concert doing good. It was in fulfilment of the duties of his mediatorial office that "Jesus went about all the cities and villages, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and healing every sickness, and every disease among the people."—Matthew, ix., 35.

When the wearied Emanuel sat down on Jacob's Well, and craved of the wondering woman a draught of its cooling beverage, it was less to refresh the frail mortal than to afford the indwelling God an occasion to plant a twig of the tree of life in the moral desert of Samaria. In his solitary and prolonged prayers, the God concurred and participated with the man. To instruct, as well as to save the world, was the purpose of his mediatorial mission. The duty of frequent and retired devotion was one of the primary lessons taught, practically as well as theoretically, by this Schoolmaster from above. In the solitude of night, on the lonely mountain, the God, too, might best resume his sweet communion with the beloved brethren of his everlasting reign. It was the King

of Zion, in his united natures, who, in fulfilment of an inspired prediction, rode into Jerusalem, "lowly and meek, and sitting upon an ass, and a colt, the foal of an ass."—Matthew, xxi., 5. Zechariah, ix., 9. When Jesus mourned over the devoted, yet still beloved city which had killed the prophets and stoned those who had come to it as messengers of grace, his pathetic wailing betokened less the yearning of his human heart than the travail of his divine spirit.

In all the miracles of Christ, his two natures, according to the measure of their respective capacities, concurred and participated. The man was bidden to the marriage of Cana; the God there accomplished his "beginning of miracles." It was the man whose hand was laid upon the sick and the suffering; it was the God who imparted to that hand its healing power. It was the corporeal substance of Jesus that walked upon the waves; it was his ethereal essence that upheld it there. It was the hand of the man that broke the "five barley loaves" and the "two small fishes;" it was the potency of the God that multiplied, and multiplied, and multiplied them into superabundant aliment for five thousand famished persons. It was the body of the man that was transfigured on the mountain; it was the mandate of the God that made "his face shine as the sun,



and his raiment white as the light," and that summoned Moses and Elias from heaven, to behold the prospective glory of the incarnate Deity. It was the voice of the man that called Lazarus forth from the grave; it was the fiat of the God which forced even the reluctant grave to yield up its victim.

"Jesus wept." His tears were not the ebullitions of mere human sympathy. He had foreseen the decease of his friend, and might have averted it by his presence or his mandate. He was just about, by the mere word of his power, to reanimate the dead. The physician weeps not, though the symptoms may wring tears from surrounding relatives, if he knows that, by a touch of his lancet, he can at once restore health and cheerfulness. The tomb of Lazarus symbolized a world "dead in trespasses and sins." Over the grave of that world destroyed Jesus stood, and "Jesus wept." The word even of Omnipotence could not reanimate moral death. For that malady, the only cure was the blood of God. Jesus wept as a man; more especially as a God did Jesus weep.

If the two natures of Christ thus concurred and participated in the multifarious sayings and doings of his mediatorial life, why should the epoch of suffering have wrought a severance in natures



which had become united and indivisible? We have already seen that the God lacked not physical or moral capacity to suffer. We have justly inferred that suffering, actual, not figurative, was the object for which he had left the heavenly reins of universal government to wear the humble weeds of humanity. Why, then, should his divinity have retired into abeyance from the impending conflict, leaving its frail earthly associate to tread alone "the wine-press of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God?"

The uncreated Son did not retire from the impending conflict. He bore his own infinite share of the curse of sin. Golgotha felt, in the trembling of its solid mount, the viewless and nameless throes of the suffering God. Whose voice was it that uttered the heaven-piercing cry, "My God! my God! why hast thou forsaken me?" It was the same voice that had commanded the winds and the waves, and they obeyed. It was the same voice which had assumed the awful appellation of the Old Testament, "I am." It was the same voice that had declared, "I and my Father are one."

The wailing voice was, of course, the voice of the sufferer. If it was the united voice of his com-

bined natures, then, beyond peradventure, the natures unitedly suffered. Those who affirm that the divine essence did not participate in the moan, encounter the more than Sisyphean task of demonstrating that the indwelling God had retired from the scene of wo, leaving the struggling man alone; that the divine voice which called Lazarus forth from the grave was hushed in profound silence; and that the piteous cries from Calvary were the mere human wailings of Mary's son. The son of the Virgin was not the forsaken of his God. His own God, his kindred God, his sympathizing, indwelling God would never, for a moment, have forsaken him. To him his indwelling God was bound by ties indissoluble. But the incarnate Deity was himself writhing under the more than scorpion sting of the sins of a world. The forsaken of God was, alas! the indwelling God himself. The forsaken of the Father was the Father's own, only-begotten, well-beloved, eternal Son. The wailing voice, in anticipation of which the luminary of day had hidden its saddened face, was the same voice which, at the beginning, had spoken that luminary into being. The other dying cry from the cross, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do," was also of that same divine and forgiving Voice, who, "walking in the garden in the cool of the day," had cheered the despairing hearts of the guilty, penitent pair with

the distant, yet radiant vision of ever-cherished, ever-brightening hope.—Genesis, iii., 8, 15.

The prevalent theory might as well seek to exclude the participation of the divinity from any other department of the mediatorial office as from its suffering department. The Bible declares that Christ went about preaching the “gospel of the kingdom.” The Bible declares that Christ wrought a succession of stupendous miracles. The Bible declares that Christ suffered for the redemption of the world. Each declaration designates the Actor by the name of Christ, or one of its synonymes. Each declaration is couched in the same unequivocal terms, without exception, restriction, or qualification. Each declaration pervades the united natures of the Messiah.

The prevalent theory has singled out the pains of the suffering department as the sole subject of its exclusion of divine participation. Why this distinction? There is the same scriptural evidence of the participation of the God in the mediatorial sufferings as there is of the participation of the God in the preaching of the gospel or the working of the miracles. There was no peculiar exigency in the two last-named departments specially requiring the actual presence of the Deity. Peter and Paul preached the gospel and wrought

miracles without an indwelling God. His delegated authority sufficed, while he himself remained "high and lifted up" on his celestial throne. If the mediatorial Preacher of the gospel was the God-man in his united natures; if the mediatorial Worker of the miracles was the God-man in his united natures, so must the mediatorial Sufferer have been the God-man in his united natures. Any distinction is arbitrary. It has no scriptural authority.

There was, indeed, a special and peculiar reason why the God should have participated in the agonies of the suffering department. His actual participation alone gave to those agonies their redeeming value. He could communicate, without his actual presence, the right to preach the gospel and the power to work miracles. The infinite burden of suffering for the redemption of man was incommunicable. It was to be borne by the God, not by his substitute. The God was himself to suffer, not merely the man substituted for the God. The man was to bear the finite share, the God the infinite share of the expiatory agonies.

The union between the second person of the Trinity and his terrestrial adjunct was intimate beyond conception. They were one and indivisible. The duration of the union was to be eter-

nal. They now share together the glory of heaven. The conclusion seems inevitable that they must have shared together the sufferings of earth. We believe that severance in suffering would have been as incompatible with the laws of their union as severance in glory.

The mediation between God and man was a suffering mediation. Its element was suffering. In suffering it began; in suffering was it "finished." In all that pertained to this suffering mediation, both natures of the incarnate Deity concurred and participated, according to the measure of their respective capacities. The man did all that humanity could do; the God did all that infinite love could prompt. Neither of the two natures was at any time inert; neither in a state of abeyance.

In the first mediatorial movement, the God was the sole Actor. He became incarnate; he cast off "the form of God;" he "emptied himself" of his celestial glory; he took upon him the "form of a servant;" he became the lowly son of a lowly Virgin; he was born in a manger, and wrapped in its straw. That the manger actually contained, and that its straw actually covered Him who formed the worlds was no fiction. The miraculous star and the worship of the Oriental wise

men demonstrated a present Deity. The star was not an *ignis fatuus* to lure men into idolatry. The everlasting mandate, "worship God," was not forgotten in heaven. Sufferance was the object for which the second person of the Sacred Three thus "humbled himself." In the conclave of the Godhead it had been deemed most fitting that he should suffer clothed in the flesh of fallen man. The humiliation was real; the transformation not metaphorical; the suffering was actual.

In the manger of Bethlehem the son of Mary began to enact his humble part. The incarnate God, in early infancy, was carried into Egypt. It was a hurried, wintry journey, marked with all the privations of penury. Back again was he hurried to the land of Israel, not to find his native home there; for, "being warned of God in a dream," his parents turned aside, to dwell as obscure strangers in the city of Nazareth. In all these privations, He who, from everlasting, had occupied the right-hand throne of glory, concurred and participated. Into his distressed estate he carried not the beatitude of his celestial home. He had "emptied himself" of that, as well as of "the form of God." The second who bears "record in heaven" was, in very truth, on the earth, "wounded for our transgressions," and "bruised for our iniquities."

The allegation of the prevalent theory, that the second person of the Trinity, in becoming incarnate, "emptied himself" of his glory alone, retaining in full perfection all his infinite beatitude, has no other foundation than the imagination of its advocates. Transcendent, indeed, is the glory of God. Moses could not have seen it, in all its effulgence, and lived.—Exodus, xxxiii., 18, 20. Of the glory of the Highest we would speak with humility and fear; yet we trust that, without irreverence, we may be permitted to suppose that it pertains rather to the expression of his ineffable excellence than to that intrinsic excellence itself. It is the external manifestation of inherent, viewless, and infinite perfection. The glory of God is the robe of majesty in which he arrays himself "as with a garment." His beatitude dwells within, while his glory unceasingly surrounds him, as the halo sometimes circles the luminary of day. The supposition that the God, about to become incarnate, cast aside his glory alone, retaining and carrying with him to earth his infinite beatitude, is opposed to the letter and the spirit of the declarations of the Holy Ghost.

We read in Oriental story of Eastern monarchs doffing their regal attire, and traversing their domains in peasant weeds, to become the unknown spectators of the variegated and bustling drama



of social life, retaining, during their metamorphosis, all their royal felicity, and bringing it back with them untouched to their thrones. Such was not the holy transformation of the Son of God. To mark its reality and completeness, the Holy Ghost selected the most potent expressions found in human speech; expressions too strong for the fastidiousness of modern translators; expressions unsatisfied by the doffing of the mere external robes of majesty; expressions pervading the inner being, and reaching that vital region of sensation and life where beatitude dwells. The God about to become incarnate could not have been said to have "emptied himself," in the full meaning of the mighty terms, if the infinitude of his celestial blessedness accompanied him through his earthly pilgrimage; making the straw of the manger as downy a pillow as the bosom of his Father; the revilings, and scoffings, and hissings of the crucifying mob as little annoying as the hallelujahs of heaven; the garden and the cross as redolent of bliss as his celestial throne.

The emptying himself of his infinite beatitude was peculiarly appropriate to the God, about to become an incarnate sufferer. Suffering was the object of his terrestrial mission. The suffering of its Creator was the price to be paid for the redemption of a lost world. To qualify him for his



suffering office, it was needful that the self-devoted Mediator should divest himself of his primitive blessedness. "The Captain of our salvation" could not carry the beatific peace of heaven along with him into his terrible campaign on earth. It was not with gleeful heart, any more than in triumphal robes, that "the wine-press of the wrath and fierceness of Almighty God" was to be trodden.

The redeeming God was present, and partaking in all the wanderings and hardships of the redeeming man. He was baptized by the reluctant and trembling John. On him rested the descending dove. For him the voice from heaven proclaimed once, and again, and yet again, "This is my beloved Son." The elements recognised and obeyed the present Deity. Devils believed and trembled. He forgave sins. He proclaimed himself "Lord even of the Sabbath day." He toiled with his own hands. The architect of the universe became a laborious carpenter in the workshop of Joseph. Of his Godhead as well as his manhood was uttered the pathetic exclamation, "The Son of man hath not where to lay his head." The Creator of the world found in it no spot of repose until the kind grave received him. He was steeped "in poverty to the very lips." To pay the tribute money which the law exacted, he was obliged to work a miracle.

The manner in which human reason—at least the reason of the learned—has met and received the declarations of scripture, that the eternal Son suffered for our redemption, is a curiosity in theological literature. It has rejected the glorious mass of this celestial truth, and clung only to a fragment. It has gatuitously limited the unlimited declarations of heaven, that the eternal Son suffered for our sins, by the earth-born amendment, “except in his divine nature.” The exception nearly absorbs the totality of the blessed truth. The remnant left bears a less proportion to the majestic whole than the scarcely perceptible promontory bears to the mighty continent of which it forms so inconsiderable a part.

To this exception of its own creation, human reason has clung with a tenacity which the lapse of centuries has not been able to sever. On what basis does the exception rest? Not on the basis of the Bible; for the declarations of scripture are unqualified and without exception; they are as munificent and illimitable as the love of the self-devoted God. The exception is the progeny, not of the Bible, but of that long-continued and wide-spread hypothesis, “God is impassible.” If this hypothesis should be exploded from Christian theology, the exception which it has engendered would sink, with its parent, into nothing. That

the hypothesis itself was but the offspring of human reasoning, we have already shown.

We profoundly reverence science. It has transmuted into plain and palpable truth, that which, without it, might have seemed poetic rhapsody. "What a piece of work is man! how noble in reason! how infinite in faculties! in form and moving, how express and admirable! in action, how like an angel! in apprehension, how like a God!" Nor does science ever appear so majestic as when wearing its sacred tiara. Yet has science pride. Even sacred science is not always as humble as was its "meek and lowly" Master.

"In pride, in reasoning pride" its "error lies."

Else, why has it scaled the heavens and tried to bind the Omnipotent in its own puny chains? Else, why has it denied to the eternal Son the ineffable personification of infinite love, his high prerogative of self-sacrifice to redeem a ruined world, and, perhaps, save a universe threatened by an inundation of triumphant sin?

## CHAPTER VIII.

Had there been any Distinction between the two Natures of Christ in the Article of Suffering, it would have been indicated in the Bible—Intellectual Character of Paul—Two Passages from 1 Peter, declaring that Christ suffered in the Flesh, considered and explained—Bishop Pearson again examined—Term Flesh, when applied to Christ, designates his whole united Being—Term Body, when applied to Christ, has the same comprehensive Meaning—So has the term Man.

HAD there been any distinction between the two natures of Christ in the essential, the paramount article of suffering, it was not only to be expected, but it was important that the inspired writers should have pointed it out. It would have been one of the landmarks of Christian faith, not to be left afloat at the mercy of opinion. The inspired writers had been well schooled in the doctrines taught by the Holy Ghost, and were fully competent to expound them with simplicity and precision.

Take, for instance, the great apostle of the Gentiles; and at the mention of the name of Paul, we cannot withhold the expression of our admiration of his wonderful endowments, even at the hazard of a momentary deviation from the straight and onward pathway of our argument. For profound-

ness of intellect; for loftiness of imagination; for that glowing enthusiasm which breathes into genius the breath of life, he stood unsurpassed among the sons of humanity. Had terrestrial ambition contented him, he might have been the Demosthenes of his oppressed country, thundering forth against Roman domination the same piercing bolts which the Athenian statesman, and patriot, and orator hurled at the head of Philip. He had drunk copiously of "the sweets of sweet philosophy;" with the choicest treasures of the Grecian muse, he was familiar as with "household words;" but all his mental wealth and literary acquisitions were laid humbly at the feet of his Redeemer. The variegated and lucid colouring, and the richest flowers that he had gathered in the fertile fields of learning, he freely offered up to make more clear the lineaments, and to deck the lovely brow of that meek and lowly religion which had been cradled in the manger of Bethlehem, and brought up among the fishermen of Galilee.

Paul, so deeply instructed in the lore of inspiration; Paul, who had been caught up into the third heaven, and shown things which it was not lawful for him to intimate "to ears of flesh and blood," could not have been ignorant of the kind and extent of his Saviour's sufferings; and had there ex-

isted a distinction between his two natures in the grand article of suffering, the philosophic, the logical, the lucid, the discriminating Paul would not have failed to indicate it somewhere in his voluminous writings, even if omitted by the less-extended authors of the New Testament. It is not intimated by any of the inspired writers, because it was not intimated to any of them by the Holy Ghost. The distinction is earthborn. The general scriptural declarations of Christ's sufferings, then, according to every legitimate rule of construction, apply to his divine and human natures unitedly. The Bible not having severed their meaning, it is as indivisible as the two natures of Christ.

St. Peter, indeed, speaks of Christ having suffered and died for us in the flesh. There are two passages in which this affirmation is made by that apostle. The first is as follows: "For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit."—1 Peter, iii., 18. The second passage is as follows: "Forasmuch, then, as Christ hath suffered for us in the flesh, arm yourselves likewise with the same mind."—1 Peter, iv., 1. Bishop Pearson has invoked these two passages into the support of the prevalent theory that Christ's sufferings were con-

fined to his humanity.\* And as they are the only scriptural passages which he has cited as bearing directly on the subject, we are doubtless justified in concluding that they were the only ones he could find. With the profoundest respect for the learned and pious prelate, we are constrained to dissent from his construction. Several answers may be given to the argument sought to be derived from these passages.

First. St. Peter might have meant to speak only of the time of Christ's passion, not of its locality. He might have intended to say that Christ suffered while he was in the flesh on earth, not that his flesh, or even his manhood, was the sole or peculiar recipient of his suffering. In his epistle to the Hebrews, St. Paul, when referring to the "prayers and supplications, with strong crying and tears," offered up by Christ, designated their date by the words, "in the days of his flesh."—Hebrews, v., 7. So St. Peter may, perhaps, be understood as having merely declared that Christ suffered and died "in the days of his flesh."

Secondly. The passages from 1 Peter contain nothing beyond the simple affirmation that Christ suffered and died in the flesh, a proposition that no one of modern times is wild enough to deny. But

\* Pearson on the Creed, p. 312.



they contain no declaration that he did not also suffer in his spirit, human and divine. The participation of his divinity in his sufferings is entirely compatible with the passages. The expression of the existence of one thing is, indeed, sometimes held to be the exclusion of the existence of a correlative thing. But that rule cannot govern the present case. The aim of the apostle, in the chapters from whence these passages are taken, and also in the preceding chapter, was to impress on his brethren the duty of following the example of Christ, especially in the article of suffering. To give the more point to his appeal, he might naturally have placed in its front ground the outward and visible suffering of their common master. It would not be surprising if, on this particular occasion, he designed to present rather the imitable example of the suffering man than the inimitable example of the suffering God, as the pattern to be followed by the suffering faithful. So that the declarations in 1 Peter, that Christ suffered in the flesh, even taking the term flesh in its restricted and literal sense, are not an exclusion, express or implied, of the conclusion that he also suffered in both of his immaterial substances.

Thirdly. But the most conclusive answer to the passages from 1 Peter remains to be stated. And as this additional solution commingles itself with



various other matters of debate between the advocates of the prevalent theory and ourselves, we shall be excused if we examine it a little more in detail than we should have deemed necessary, had a reply to the passages from 1 Peter been the sole object in view. The Bible often employs expressions, applicable, in their primary and strict sense, to the outer being only, to designate also the inner being. Thus the term flesh, in its primary and literal import, expresses only the body. But it is often used figuratively in scripture to include the immaterial as well as the material part of man. Take the following samples of this scriptural use of the term: "I will not fear what flesh can do unto me," exclaimed the Psalmist.—Psalm lvi., 4. And again: "For he remembereth that they were but flesh."—Psalm lviii., 39. "No flesh shall have peace," saith the prophet.—Jeremiah, xii., 12. And again: "Cursed be the man that trusteth in man, and maketh flesh his arm."—Jeremiah, xvii., 5. "For all flesh is grass," declared the apostolic Peter.—1 Peter, i., 24.

The incarnate God had flesh. The flesh in which he dwelt became the peculiar flesh of the eternal Word. It was moulded out of the common mass of human flesh, and was set apart and consecrated as the appropriate flesh of the Son of God. It is now his raised and glorified flesh,

seated at the right hand of his Father. Though the corporeal garment, in which he clothed himself, was taken originally from the great storehouse of humanity, it became unspeakably exalted by the transcendent dignity of its divine wearer.

The term flesh, applied by St. Peter to the incarnate God, in the passages so much relied on by Bishop Pearson, was, we have little doubt, a figure of speech to denote the whole united person of the Redeemer, human and divine. That the apostle used the term figuratively, at least to a certain extent, will not be denied by the generality of our opponents. Few of them will contend, with the celebrated commentator Whitby, that the sufferings of our Lord were confined literally to his body. It would ill comport with the generally received conceptions to suppose that mere "corporal sufferance" was accepted by the infinite Father as a full propitiation for the transgressions of the world. Even the advocates of the prevalent theory will, therefore, generally understand the declarations of St. Peter to import mental as well as bodily sufferings. But, in their allowance of a figurative meaning to his declarations, the advocates of the prevalent theory stop short at the line separating Christ's human soul from his ethereal essence. Why stop at that line? Inspiration has left no landmark there. The land-

mark there, which has appeared for ages, is an earthly structure, reared by human hands. If the scriptural meaning of the term flesh, when applied to man, has ample capacity to comprehend the corporeal and immaterial natures of our whole aggregate race, why may not the scriptural meaning of the same term, when applied to the flesh of the incarnate Word, be capacious enough to include both of the united natures of the Son of God, though the chief element in the immaterial part of his united natures was his ethereal essence?

That the term flesh, in scriptural language, when applied to the incarnate God, includes his whole united being, human and divine, is not left to be deduced by any mere reasoning process. "And the word was made flesh, and dwelt among us."—John, i., 14. Here the flesh consecrated by the indwelling Deity was clearly used to denote both his natures. But for this scriptural meaning of the term, when thus divinely applied, we have still more explicit authority, coming direct from the lips of one of the Holy Three. "I am the living bread which came down from heaven: if a man eat of this bread, he shall live forever: and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world."—John, vi., 51. In this passage, Christ used the terms "my flesh" to designate that "living bread which came down

from heaven ;” which he gave “ for the life of the world ;” and of which, if any man eats, “ he shall live forever.” He employed the terms to denote the whole infinite totality of his mediatorial sacrifice. He used them as an appropriate name, when applied to himself, to comprehend, not only his body and human soul, but also that ethereal Essence, who had, from everlasting, occupied the right-hand throne of heaven.

If St. Peter used the term flesh, in the two passages under review, according to its scriptural meaning when applied to Christ—a meaning which he himself had heard his beloved Master ordain and establish by the word of his own supremacy—then the conclusion is inevitable, that the apostle meant to declare that our Saviour had suffered and died in both his united natures. He used the term without exception or restriction, and must be understood to have intended all that the term imports. If this conclusion is correct, then the two passages from 1 Peter, invoked and marshalled against us by the modern representative of the prevalent theory as competent of themselves to vanquish all opposition, are found in the day of trial, though forming his whole array, to leave the service into which they had been impressed, and, passing over into our ranks, to form two of the chief supporters of our argument.

So the word body has its figurative meaning, and is often used to denote the inner as well as the outer man. Hence the expressions "somebody" and "nobody." Hence, when we use the colloquial phrase "everybody," so constantly repeated in common parlance, we include not only the bodies, but also the spirits of all to whom we refer. The scripture has borrowed the same figurative use of the word body, and applied it even to Christ. "And you, that were some time alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled in the body of his flesh through death."—Colossians, i., 21, 22. "By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all."—Hebrews, x., 10. "Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree."—1 Peter, ii., 24. In these passages, the inspired writers used not the word "body" merely to denote the clay tabernacle of Christ; for then would they have made his sufferings literally and strictly corporeal, thereby sinking their dignity from the infinite to the finite. They used the term "body" as expressive, not only of the outward visible materiality, but also of the immaterial, breathing, living principle within.

When our Lord, at the institution of his commemorative supper, gave to his disciples the sacramental bread, declaring "This is my body," he

did not mean that the body of which the bread was symbolical consisted of the mere corporeal temple of his flesh. That alone was not the price to be paid for the redemption of the world. The terms "my body," according to the sublime meaning of the divine speaker, comprehended the indwelling God, whose self-sacrifice was to sanctify that outer temple, and form a glorious structure of salvation worthy of its great architect. The consecrated bread was typical, not only of the material, but also of the viewless and spiritual substance of the God incarnate. The terms were used by Christ to represent and designate the whole infinitude of his united being.

The scriptural custom of using the outer name to denote the inner being is exemplified in a still more striking instance. The second person of the Trinity, shrouded in flesh, was often called man by his own inspired apostles. Even he, who was caught up into the third heaven, frequently so termed his beloved and divine Master. "Ye men of Israel, hear these words; Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you."—Acts, ii., 22. "Because he hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness, by that man whom he hath ordained."—Acts, xvii., 31. "For if through the offence of one many be dead, much more the grace of God, and

the gift by grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many.”—Romans, v., 15. There is “one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus.”—1 Timothy, ii., 5. “But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins, forever sat down on the right hand of God.”—Hebrews, x., 12.

These inspired writers well knew—they felt in every pulsation of their throbbing hearts—the melting, the exalting truth, that the manhood of their Redeemer bore a less proportion to his Godhead than the dim and fading star of morning bears to “the glorious king of day rejoicing in the east.” Yet they called him man. They thus gave a seeming prominence to his manhood, only as a faint emblem—a shadowy figure of the ineffable splendours of the Godhead throned within. Thus they added a crowning illustration to the scriptural custom of expressing, by things that are seen, things that are invisible. We close this train of thought, protracted, perhaps, too long, with a request to the reader that he will apply our remarks to kindred passages, which, escaping our notice, may occur to his, and which, though seemingly confined to the outer man of Christ, and tending to limit his sufferings to his humanity, may nevertheless, on a little examination, be found to comprehend also the indwelling Godhead.



## CHAPTER IX.

Blood and Death of Christ—Blood, when applied to Christ, has a Meaning more comprehensive than its ordinary Import—It means Totality of Expiatory Sufferings—Christ really died—Death reached both his Natures.

THERE is yet another class of scriptural passages bearing upon the question under discussion, which requires a more deliberate consideration. The efficiency of the blood of Christ in the scheme of redemption is a cardinal doctrine of the New Testament. It asserts that we are washed in his blood; that we are cleansed by his blood; that we are made white by his blood; that we are purged by his blood; that we are redeemed by his blood; that he bought us with his blood; that without the shedding of blood there could be no remission. So the death of Christ is plainly shadowed forth in the Old Testament, and forms the absorbing theme of the New. Now it is said that blood and death could not have been predicated of the ethereal essence of the Godhead; that God is a Spirit, without blood or corporeal substance; that God is an eternal Spirit, and necessarily incapable of dying. Hence it is confidently urged that the oft-repeated scriptural declarations concerning the blood and death of our blessed Lord



must have referred to the man Christ Jesus, and not to the indwelling God. The answers, the conclusive answers to these imposing objections, may be arranged under two heads.

First. The incarnate God had blood. It was sweated forth at Gethsemane ; it was poured out on Calvary. But the Bible, in speaking of Christ's blood, gives to the term a meaning vastly more comprehensive than its ordinary signification. When our Lord, the same night in which he was betrayed, after supper, took the cup, and, having given thanks, gave it to his disciples, saying, "Drink ye all of it, for this is my blood of the New Testament;" and when his disciples, in obedience to his command, drank of the cup, they did not actually drink of the blood then flowing warm in the veins of their Master ; the sacramental fluid of which they partook was the "blood of the New Testament;" that mystical, viewless ocean of salvation provided, by the whole expiatory sufferings of Christ, for "the healing of the nations." In thus expanding the term blood, when used to denote the blood of the Mediator between God and man, we place ourselves upon the authority of the dying declarations of the eternal Son. The expansion of the term, when applied to his own most precious blood, was dictated by his own unerring lips.—Matthew, xxvi., 27, 28. So, when

the New Testament declares that the redeemed of every age and nation are “washed,” and “cleansed,” and “made white,” and “purged” by the blood of Christ, it means not to use the term in its strict literal import, but in the same comprehensive sense in which our Saviour had himself used it at the institution of his holy eucharist.

In this vast ocean of infinite grace, opened at the dawn of time, Abel, and Enoch, and Noah, and Abraham, and Lot were regenerated and sanctified, centuries before the vital element had begun to circulate through the arteries of the infant Jesus. In this same never-ebbing ocean, boundless as the love of God, will all the countless myriads of the redeemed of all times, and tongues, and climes continue to be “washed,” and “cleansed,” and “made white,” and “redeemed,” until the mighty angel, standing with one foot on the sea and the other on the earth, and lifting his hand to heaven, shall swear by him that liveth forever and ever that there shall be time no longer.

Christ is said, in scripture, to have purchased us with his blood. But how small a part did the blood actually drawn from his veins by the sweat of Gethsemane and the irons of Calvary form of the infinite price which he paid! The price, the infinite price of the purchase, was the whole stu-

pendous aggregate of his humiliation and sufferings. The first great payment was made when he exchanged his throne in heaven for the manger of Bethlehem. The payments were continued every day of his suffering life. From his birth to his death, he was "a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief." He wandered about houseless and friendless, hungry and athirst. He had not, like the foxes of the field, a hole to which he might retire; he had not, like the birds of the air, a nest wherein he might repose. He was hunted, "like a partridge on the mountains," until he found rest in the tomb of Joseph. Gethsemane had poured its copious and tearful contribution into the treasury of justice, and the last instalment of the mighty debt created by our sins was paid on Calvary.

By the blood of Christ, then, the oracles of truth mean the totality of the merits of his expiatory sufferings. This explanation solves the seeming mystery of Paul's injunction, "Feed the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood."—Acts, xx., 28. The proposition contained in the injunction was literally correct. God the Son, in very fact, purchased the Church with his own blood, according to the sublime meaning of the term, as expounded by himself at his sacramental supper. The passage from Acts, then, is clear proof that the Godhead of Christ partici-

pated in his sufferings; for, had not his Godhead participated, the sufferings with which he purchased his Church could not have been called the blood of God. He purchased his Church, not with the pains of the man alone, but with the humiliation and agonies of the God, actual, and not merely constructive. Had the man only suffered, the stupendous proposition would not have been true, that God purchased the Church "with his own blood." The Bible deals little in detail. By one or two trumpet-notes, it is wont to awaken trains of thought sufficient to fill uninspired volumes. Had it recounted all the variegated sufferings of Christ, corporeal and mental, human and divine, we would almost be led to suppose that, literally, "even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written."—John, xxi., 25. From the countless group of his agonies, the Bible has selected the palpable and startling incident of his shed blood—an incident always appalling to humanity—as one well calculated deeply to impress on the imagination, the memory, and the hearts of men the whole most pathetic tragedy of his vicarious sufferings, divine and human, commencing when he left the right hand of his Father, and ending not until, from the cross, he cried, "it is finished," and gave up the ghost.

Secondly. The incarnate God could die. He

did die. Without his life-giving death the Bible would be a dead letter, or, rather, "a consuming fire." The incarnate God, in his united natures, was born of woman, as the ordinary sons of humanity are born; he died in his united natures, as the ordinary sons of humanity die. If the Godhead of Christ is an eternal spirit, so is the soul of an ordinary man, as to the eternity to come. The human soul is as deathless as the ethereal essence of its Creator. The soul of an ordinary man does not cease to be at his death, any more than the ethereal essence of the Son of God ceased to be when he died in his united natures. There is nothing more startling in the idea that the second person of the Trinity really died in his united natures than there is in the thought that he really became incarnate and was born.

But we rest our position, that the second person of the Trinity really died in his united natures, upon authority as much above the dogmas of human reason as the heavens are higher than the earth. After the resurrection of Christ, his lately crucified, but now risen and spiritualized body, accompanied its divine occupant to his celestial home, bearing, no doubt, on its hands the print of the nails, and in its side the mark of the spear shown to the unbelieving Thomas.

It was the second person of the Trinity, clothed in his now glorified vestment of flesh, who appeared to St. John when he was in the Spirit on the Lord's day, commencing with the thrilling declaration, "I am the first and the last; I am he that liveth and was dead, and, behold, I am alive forever more."—Revelation, i., 17, 18. The same divine speaker, in the eleventh verse, declared of himself, "I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last." Who was he of whom the declaration was thus made that he had been dead? It was the same being who was alive again. And who was he that was thus alive? It was the God-man in his united natures. To give truth, then, to the divine declaration, it must have been the God-man, in his united natures, who had been dead.

Nor is this all. The glorious apparition at Patmos, in declaring that he had been dead, did not intend merely to refer to the severance of the immaterial and material parts of his being. The speaker was the Creator and the Ruler of the universe. When he said that he himself, his own, undivided, majestic self, had been dead, he did not mean to point alone to the visible extinction of his life on Calvary. He must rather have primarily intended to intimate to that beloved disciple, who had leaned on his bosom, as far as mortal ears could hear and live, those mysterious agonies,

aptly termed death, which, as the incarnate substitute for sin, his divine spirit had endured from the overflowing deluge of infinite wrath.

The declaration at Patmos was by the God of truth. It was, as it were, his official proclamation to the universe of a stupendous event, in which he had been himself the Actor. The declaration must have been the essence of ingenuous truth; true to the letter, true to the ostensive import of its unlimited terms in all their amplitude; without covert meaning or misleading innuendo. How do the sanctity and the plenitude of its awful truth overwhelm that theory of man which would make the God at Patmos, notwithstanding the unqualified universality of his words, intend nothing more than that his death had consisted in the mere dissolution of his frail garment of humanity, leaving unimpaired and untouched his own divine beatitude!

There are other expressions, not yet the subject of comment, in this august passage, which seem to carry along with them intrinsic demonstration that the redeeming God had been dead, and was alive again. He who spoke, and he who had been dead, and he who was alive again, was identical. The speaker applied to himself, in the three stages of his action—the speaking, the dying,



and the resuscitated stage—the same personal pronoun, “I am he that liveth and was dead; and, behold, I am alive forever more.” If the speaker was God, it follows that he who had been dead and was alive again was also God. That he who spoke was God, is self-evident from the fact that he appropriated to himself, perhaps, the loftiest attribute of the Godhead. He styled himself “the First,” “the Alpha.” The Alpha, then, was he who spoke, and had been dead, and was alive again. The Alpha was the speaking God, the dying God, the living God of this ever-living passage. To predicate all this of the human son of the Virgin would be impiety, were it not for innocence of intention. The human son of the Virgin was created out of nothing in the reign of Herod; he was not coeval with the uncreated Ancient of Days. Instead of being the principal personage of the passage, the human son of the Virgin was not named in it, or even made the subject of allusion. He was not thus named, or even made the subject of allusion, because he was only the guise, the vestment, the human veil covering the ineffable and shrouded glories of the speaking God, the dying God, the resuscitated God of the first chapter of Revelation.

But reason here interposes her speculations and her objections. She deems that the declarations



of the God at Patmos, if literally understood, would come into collision with his attributes; that he had not capacity to suffer in his united natures; that if he had the capacity, it was not "fitting to God" thus to suffer; that the declarations of the God at Patmos are too high, too vast, too incomprehensible and stupendous to be entitled to full credence, according to the plain import of the terms. We would respectfully invite the authors of these suggestions to turn their eyes to the eighth and ninth verses of the fifty-fifth chapter of Isaiah. "For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts."

The revealed "ways" and "thoughts" of God are not only beyond, but sometimes seemingly opposed to reason. To yield them implicit credence often requires a flight of sublime faith not of easy attainment. Yet Abraham, the father of the faithful, "staggered not at the promise of God through unbelief." Proud philosophy might have urged that the fulfilment of the promise involved a physical impossibility. Yet the faithful Abraham "believed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness."—Romans, iv., 3, 20. Our argument asks nothing but belief in the declarations of the living

God. It seeks not to sustain the doctrine that the Godhead of Christ participated in his expiatory sufferings by the frail props of human reasoning. It fixes its great doctrine on the adamantine foundation, that "the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it."—Isaiah, i., 20. The doctrine developed may, indeed, be too lofty for mortal comprehension. It may be opposed to what reason deems "fitting to God." It may come into imagined collision with the attributes of the Deity. It should, nevertheless, be enough to convince, at least to silence unbelief, that "the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it."

The meaning of the term death and its synonyms, when applied by inspiration to the ethereal essence of the incarnate God, will be made a theme of reverential inquiry in some part of the ensuing chapter.

## CHAPTER X.

Death of the Eternal Son—Scriptural Passages proving it—His Exaltation—What was meant by his Death—Not mere Physical Death—Why his Sufferings called Death—Visible Expiration on Cross, but Representative of his viewless Death.

THE great apostle to the Gentiles declared, “When we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son.”—Romans, v., 10. The two following passages are found in one of the epistles of the beloved disciple: “Hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life for us.”—1 John, iii., 16. “In this was manifested the love of God towards us, because that God sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him. Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins.”—1 John, iv., 9, 10. We have presented these two passages from 1 John in the order in which they stand in the epistle, but shall, nevertheless, consider the last first.

Who was the “propitiation for our sins?” He was the “only begotten Son” of the Father; he was the Son, whom the Father “sent” “into the world.” It was not the human son of the Virgin.

That terrestrial son—that son by adoption—was not the “only begotten Son” of the Father. Nor was he begotten of the Father at all; the conception of the Virgin was by the power of the Holy Ghost.—Luke, i., 35. The human son of Mary was not “sent” “into the world;” it was in the world that he was born and created. “The propitiation for our sins,” then, was no less a being than the second person of the Trinity.

How did the second person of the Trinity become “the propitiation for our sins?” The beloved disciple himself informs us, in the first of the passages transcribed from his epistle. The second person of the Trinity became “the propitiation for our sins” when “he laid down his life for us.” The term “death,” in the passage from Romans, means the same as the terms “he laid down his life for us,” in the passage from 1 John. In both passages the Sufferer is the same, though he is called “God” in one of the passages, and “his Son” in the other. Each passage plainly points to the second person of the Trinity, and each passage virtually declares that he died for our redemption. Of the same import is the following passage: “And the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me.”—Galatians, ii., 20. The terms “and gave himself for me”

are synonymous with the term "death" and the terms "he laid down his life for us," found in the preceding passages. Nor is the following passage of less decisive bearing: "Who, being the brightness of his" (God's) "glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the majesty on high."—Hebrews, i., 3. We learn elsewhere in scripture that the purging of our sins was effected by the blood of God.—Acts, xx., 28.

A passage that we have already partly transcribed in another connexion is too important in its influence on the present point to be omitted here. "Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus; who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God; but emptied himself, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men; and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. Wherefore God hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name: that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father."—Philippians, ii.,

5-12. The reader will perceive that we have restored to this passage the terms "emptied himself," unjustly subtracted by the translators. Who was it that, "being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God?" It was certainly the second person of the Trinity. Who was it that "emptied himself" of the glory and beatitude of his Godhead? Beyond peradventure, the second person of the Trinity. Who was it that "took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men?" Verily, the second person of the Trinity. Who was it that "humbled himself?" Not the lowly son of the lowly Virgin. No earth-born creature would have "humbled himself" by an everlasting alliance with his own kindred, indwelling God, to be consummated with a seat at the right hand of the Highest. Who was it that "became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross?" With no less certainty, it was still the second person of the Trinity. In each stage of the mighty action the second person of the Sacred Three was, in his own ethereal essence, the paramount Actor. He was as much the paramount Actor in the article of death as he was the paramount Actor in the article of incarnation. That theory which, down to the dying scene, would leave the God the Actor, and, at that trying moment, suddenly withdraw

the God, and substitute the man alone, is surely "of the earth, earthy."

To evade the seemingly resistless force of the passage from Philippians, it has been contended that the exaltation of Christ, announced towards the end of the passage, was but the exaltation of his manhood alone ; and that, as his divinity shared not in the exaltation, so his divinity participated not in the antecedent suffering. The celebrated commentator Whitby affirms that this was the doctrine of the fathers.\* The school of Athanasius were wise in thus attempting to maintain their consistency. The component parts of their system would have been in chaotic hostility with each other, if, while they maintained that the humanity of Christ alone suffered, they had allowed that both his natures were the recipients of his exaltation. The exaltation was the reward of the suffering. The suffering and its reward were inseparable. The affirmation that the Godhead of Christ shared in the exaltation would have drawn after it the affirmation that the Godhead of Christ must have participated in the suffering. The doctrine that it was the man, and not the God, who was exalted, would appear, therefore, to be a necessary element of the prevalent theory.

\* Whitby's Notes on Philippians, ii., 9.



Yet this doctrine is not taught by the Bible. The very passage from Philippians announced that the subject of the exaltation was Christ Jesus; that the name at which every knee was to bow was the name of Jesus. Christ Jesus and Jesus are synonymes, designating the same august Being. That august Being united the God and the man. The exaltation of Christ Jesus was the exaltation of both his natures. The exaltation of his manhood alone would have implied a severance of natures, made one and indivisible for eternity. The name at which every knee should bow comprehended the God. To the indwelling God belonged the infinite share of the homage of the universe. If the man could have been severed from the God, the man could not have been the object of heaven's worship. The cherubim and the seraphim would not have been taught to bow the knee to him. "Worship God" is engraved on the pillars, and the walls, and the very pavements of heaven. It was the indwelling God that gathered the bending knees around the name of Jesus.

Let it not be said that the Creator of the worlds already stood at the very pinnacle of exaltation, and therefore lacked capacity to be exalted farther. This imputed incapacity of God the Son to be exalted is german to his alleged incapacity to suffer. Both incapacities are the creations of the-



oretic man. They pertain not to the Godhead. That earnest prayer by the second person of the Trinity while incarnate on earth, "And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was," breathed forth its aspirations after that very exaltation with which he was greeted on his return to his native heavens.—John, xvii., 5.

The imagination that the persons of the Godhead could not have been exalted by the consummation of the work of redemption, is but the microscopic view of human reason. The whole Godhead were ineffably exalted. The Son was exalted. The Holy Ghost was exalted. The Father was exalted. The very passage from Philippians announced that the confession of every tongue to the supremacy of Jesus Christ should be "to the glory of God the Father." "Glory to God in the highest" was the opening of the anthem of praise by the choir of angels who had descended on the plains of Bethlehem to celebrate the birth of the infant Messiah.—Luke, ii., 14. "Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power be unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb forever," was the "new song" of heaven to magnify the riches of redeeming love.—Revelation, v., 9, 13.

On the triumphal return of the second person of the Trinity from his terrestrial pilgrimage, a new name was given him. He had borne in heaven the name of the Son. He had received on earth the appellation of the Christ. On his ascension, he was greeted at the gates of paradise as **THE SAVIOUR OF THE WORLD**. This was doubtless the "name which is above every name." The appellation of Creator he had acquired by the word of his power. This new name was consecrated in the baptism of his blood. At this name, every knee in heaven delights to bow. At this name, every knee in hell shall be constrained to bow. At this name, it is passing strange that every knee on the redeemed earth does not joyously bow !

But it is time that we should return from this unavoidable digression to the scriptural representation of the death of the uncreated Son. In this connexion, the following passage must not be omitted : " Even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many."—Matthew, xx., 28. Who was the Son of man ? He himself tells us in another of his evangelists, " And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven."—John, iii., 13. This was the Son of man, who gave " his life a ransom for many." What life

did he give as the priceless "ransom?" He gave that life "which came down from heaven." He gave that life which fills immensity. He gave that life which lived at once in heaven and on the earth. If farther scriptural proof is needed that the second person of the Trinity died "to be the propitiation for our sins," we invoke once more his own sublime proclamation to his beloved disciple at Patmos, "I am he that liveth, and was dead; and behold, I am alive for evermore, Amen."—Revelation, i., 18.

It is, then, a recorded Bible representation, that the second person of the Trinity died for our redemption. This representation, in every jot and tittle of its solemn import, must forever stand, though "heaven and earth pass away." That it is mysterious, and beyond the comprehension of human reason, is no ground for its rejection. If human reason can, at its discretion, discard every truth it does not understand, it might, by the word of its power, convert the universe into an infinite blank; for reasoning pride cannot comprehend even itself. It is enough that the death of the second person of the Trinity, to save our sinking world, is registered in the Word of God. From its sacred repository it must not be plucked by ruthless force; nor must it be extracted by the chemical process of artificial interpretation.

How are we to understand the declarations of scripture, that the second person of the Trinity died for our redemption? Human reason has its ready response. The prevalent theory would boldly affirm that he died in no other sense than by the severance of the material and immaterial parts of his manhood; that it was the redeeming man who was "wounded for our transgressions," and with whose "stripes we are healed;" that the redeeming God remained wrapped in the mantle of his impassibility; that he continued as blessed on earth as he had ever been in heaven; that his infinite beatitude was as perfect in the most trying scene of the work of redemption as it had been in the crowning scene of the work of creation.

With profound respect, yet with profounder solemnity, must we enter our humble protest against a theory which would impute to the reiterated declarations of the Word of God an illusory meaning. The Bible could no more equivocate than its divine Author could swerve from the truth. It is the very soul of ingenuous frankness. It has no covert meanings; no deceptive reservations. When it declared that the second person of the Trinity had died, it intended what was fully equivalent to all that its words import; it meant not that he died by fiction of law; it meant not that he died

in the covering of his manhood alone ; it meant not that he died merely in the death of that terrestrial worm which he had condescendingly taken into holy alliance with himself. The scriptural declarations of the death of the second person of the Trinity had a meaning real as the truth of God, high as heaven, deep as the foundations of the everlasting throne.

In this vital point, it is important that we should not be misunderstood. We will endeavour to define the position assumed by our argument so far as our finite and very limited capacity can grasp the mysteriousness and infinitude of the awful subject. It would be equally opposed to our head and to our heart to affirm that the Bible, in predicating death of the uncreated Son of God, intended to intimate that there has ever been a moment, in the flight of eternal ages, when the second person of the Trinity ceased to be. According to scripture, the death of a spirit causes no cessation of its vitality. The ethereal vigour even of the human soul is not palsied by the cold touch of physical, nor is it to be consumed by the fervent heat of spiritual death. When the second person of the Trinity "laid down his life for us" as "the propitiation for our sins," he was as much the ever-living God as when he breathed the breath of life into the nostrils of our primeval ancestor.

The second person of the Trinity atoned, by suffering in his ethereal essence, for the sins of the world. He suffered, perhaps, as much as the redeemed would, but for him, have aggregately suffered through an endless eternity. His expiatory agonies were, doubtless, beyond the conception of mortal man; probably beyond the comprehension of the highest archangel. They could not be bodied forth, with distinctness, in words to be found in any human vocabulary, nor, probably, in the vocabulary of heaven; yet spiritual things, inexpressible and incomprehensible, are often obscurely unveiled to the imagination of man by the revelation of God. So it is with the secrets of "that undiscovered country from whose bourne no traveller returns." So it is with the profounder secrets of that pavilion of woe, where he who inspired Isaiah's harp "was wounded for our transgressions" and "bruised for our iniquities." Mindful of the imperfections of human speech and the dimness of human conception, the Bible, to impart to redeemed creatures some twilight glimpses of the redeeming agonies of their Creator, has selected the most potent term known to the dwellers upon the earth; a term appalling to the imagination and affecting to the heart; a term rendered more expressive and impressive by its very obscurity and incomprehensiveness. That term is

*death!* the vague, shadowy, and awful name of the king of terrors.

The Holy Ghost, who knows all things, well knew that this mighty term, and its no less mighty synonymes, were more calculated to intimate to mortal apprehension the viewless, nameless, inconceivable sufferings of the Redeemer of the world, than any other terms which human ears could hear and live. The name of the king of terrors must have been selected, not only for its transcendent potency, but for the affinity between the spiritual or second death which awaited the redeemed and the vicarious agonies borne for them by their great Redeemer. Eternal death awaited them. Death was the name of the penalty of their transgressions. Their Redeemer took on himself the penalty. The name went along with it, as the shadow follows the substance. The term death, or either of its synonymes, then, when applied in scripture to the second person of the Trinity, meant not to intimate the cessation of his existence, even for a moment. It meant to shadow forth to the imagination and impress on the heart the image of those vicarious sufferings, equivalent to the eternal death of the redeemed, which the uncreated Son endured for their redemption.

The Bible has given a mysterious prominence



to the death of Christ, representing it as the vital element of the mediatorial sacrifice. We have seen that the blood of Christ, according to its scriptural import, means the totality of the merits of his expiatory sufferings. The body of Christ has the same comprehensiveness of signification. When, at his sacramental supper, our Lord distributed among his disciples the symbolical bread and wine, and called them his body and his blood, they typified and represented, not merely his physical body and blood, but the whole infinitude of his mediatorial merits. The death of Christ, in its scriptural import, has the same vast amplitude of signification. It was not confined to his expiration on the cross. The mediatorial death, which wrought the salvation of the world, began when the second person of the Trinity "emptied himself" of the glory and beatitude of his Godhead. It descended with him to the manger of Bethlehem. It followed him to the workshop of Joseph. It clung with a vulture's grasp to the bosom of the houseless God, through his terrestrial pilgrimage. It included the totality of his expiatory humiliation and sufferings. Calvary witnessed its consummation, not its inception.

To limit the redeeming death of the Bible to the visible expiration between the two thieves would, by narrowing the extent and depreciating



the value of the atoning offering, lower the awful standard of divine justice, and thus dim one of the brightest gems of the celestial diadem. Terrible indeed was the consummation of the atoning death. It was the outpouring of the full cup of God's wrath. Awful beyond what creatures on earth, or, probably, creatures in heaven, can express or conceive, was the concluding scene of the mediatorial drama. We would not underrate its transcendent value. Without it, not a soul could have been saved. Without it, the smoke of the torment of the redeemed must have ascended up forever and ever. The tremendous consummation on Calvary, however, consisted not chiefly in the physical death of Christ. That was but its finite element. His physical death was but the demolition of "the temple of his body," that it might be reared again more gloriously on the third day. The astonished centurion apprehended not that secret, yet almighty cause which darkened the sun, rent the rocks, and convulsed the earth.

But the hidden pavilion, in which were accomplished the sufferings of the Prince of life in his ethereal essence, witnessed throes and spasms sufficient to have dissolved the material universe, had it not been upheld by the power of its agonized Creator. The darkened pavilion, where the

sword of the Lord of Hosts inflicted on God the Son "the chastisement of our peace," was the scene of that concentration and sublimation of unearthly agonies which inspiration could but faintly intimate to our mental vision even by the vague, and shadowy, and appalling figure of the king of terrors.

That the term death, when applied to represent the expiatory sufferings, was satisfied by the physical expiration on Calvary, is a theory opposed to the letter and spirit of scripture. There were sufferings behind the veil which shut out mortal vision, unseen and nameless. Those sufferings formed the true consummation of the mediatorial death of the Bible. Of that death of deaths, the visible extinction of life on Calvary was but the shadow. The physical expiration on Calvary was the death of the redeeming man. The expiatory sufferings of the redeeming God, included, too, under the awful name of the king of terrors, and constituting the infinite portion of the redeeming sacrifice, were viewless—unseen by mortals, perhaps seen only by the Sacred Three. The strong, yet seemingly unsatisfied desire of angels to look into them intimates that they were not open, palpable, and familiar to the angelic vision.

## CHAPTER XI.

Death of Eternal Son continued—His Suffering Substitute for Spiritual Death of Redeemed—Hence said to have “tasted Death for every Man”—Consisted in outpouring on him of God’s Wrath against Sin—Comments on second Chapter of Hebrews.

THERE is a physical death, and there is a spiritual death, sometimes called, in scripture, the second death. There is a death for mortals to die, and a death of which immortals are capable of dying. When Christ said, “If a man keep my saying, he shall never see death;” and again, when he said, “And whosoever liveth, and believeth in me, shall never die,” he did not mean to exempt from physical death him who believed in him and kept his saying.—John, viii., 51 ; xi., 26. He left physical death as he found it, the common inheritance of humanity. It was from spiritual death only that our Lord promised to protect those who yielded him their belief and their obedience. When Paul declared that Christ had “abolished death,” he spoke only of the death of the redeemed soul.—2 Timothy, i., 10.

It was, then, to save us, not from physical, but from spiritual death ; not from the death of time,

but from the death of eternity, that the second person of the Trinity "laid down his life." All the redeemed of every nation, and clime, and age were destined to the relentless grasp of this undying death. They owed it an amount which human arithmetic has not powers to compute. Payment to the uttermost farthing in the sufferings of the transgressors—sufferings as ceaseless as the flow of eternity—was to be exacted. Then appeared, as their Redeemer, the second person of the glorious Trinity, clothed in the weeds of humanity. He came not to cancel or to mitigate their debts without full payment, for that would have been to make infinite justice weakly break its sword. His mediatorial mission had for its object the payment of their debts in full and in kind; the substitution of his sufferings for theirs. For their spiritual death was interposed what the Bible calls his own death. His ethereal spirit bore what their spirits must else have borne. Hence his sufferings had the same awful name which would have attached to their sufferings. Nothing short of this infinite price could have satisfied the high and inflexible requisitions of infinite justice. The redeeming price was death for death; the death of the God for the undying death of his redeemed.

This is what was meant by the Holy Ghost, speaking by the tongue of his rapt apostle, when

he said "that he" (Jesus), "by the grace of God, should taste of death for every man."—Hebrews, ii., 9. It was not the taste of physical death that was intended. Every man had drank, or was to drink, of that bitter draught for himself. From the general doom pronounced on our first parents and their descendants, "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return," the flight of six thousand years has afforded but two exceptions. Of physical death, the terrestrial son of Mary, from the laws of his human nature, must have tasted for himself, in his own person, unless he had, like Enoch and Elijah, been miraculously translated. The redeeming death, then, to be tasted, was not physical death, but an equivalent for the undying death to which the redeemed themselves stood exposed.

What composed the cup of suffering, in scripture denominated death, of which the eternal Son, clothed in flesh, tasted for every man, we know not distinctly, except that it was filled to its very brim with the wrath of Almighty God against sin. The human son of the Virgin could no more, at least within the brief space of mortal life, have drank this cup than he could have quaffed an ocean of liquid fire. But the second person of the Trinity, in the omnipotence of his might and the infinitude of his pitying grace, drained it, as the sub-

stitute of sinners, to its very dregs. It was a real, not a fictitious or seeming draining of the cup of God's wrath. No wonder that, at the unimaginable agonies of its Creator, the sun hid its face in darkness; that the rocks were rent asunder; that the earth shook to its foundations; that the repose of the dead was disturbed. This, doubtless, was the mystery of mysteries—new and “strange” in the history of the universe—which riveted the holy curiosity of heaven—into which “the angels desired to look.”—1 Peter, i., 12.

That the apostle did not, in the ninth verse of the second chapter of Hebrews, mean to intimate that it was the mere humanity of Christ which “tasted death for every man,” is manifest, not only from the kindred passages of Holy Writ, upon which we have been lately commenting, but also from the parts of this very second chapter of Hebrews which succeed the ninth verse. The succeeding verses doubtless show that the manhood of Christ suffered and died. They show much more; they evince that his divinity also participated in his sufferings and death. They utterly exclude the hypothesis that his divinity remained shrouded in impassibility. The ninth verse reads thus: “But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour; that he

by the grace of God should taste death for every man." The tenth verse reads thus : " For it became him, for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the Captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings."

The Taster of death for every man, in the ninth verse, is, in the tenth verse, styled the Captain of our salvation. The Taster of death and the Captain of our salvation are, therefore, identically one and the same. Who, then, was the Captain of our salvation ? Certainly the second person of the Trinity clothed in flesh. The human son of the Virgin was not the Captain ; he was but the subaltern in the work of redemption. To suppose that the august personage of these passages tasted death in his human nature merely, and was the Captain of our salvation, not only in his human nature, but also in his divine, is a gratuitous assumption. The concurrence of both his natures was equally necessary in each of the departments. The assumption is worse than gratuitous : it is a fatal blow to the simplicity, the directness, the ingenuousness, the harmony of these two sister verses of Sacred Writ.

The Captain of our salvation was made " perfect through sufferings." The expressions last



quoted were doubtless applied to the humanity of Christ. They were also applied to his divinity. As God, he was, indeed, infinitely perfect ere the worlds were formed. To perfect him, however, for his new office of Mediator between God and man, it was, in the conclave of eternal wisdom, deemed fitting that the farther qualifications of incarnation and suffering should be superadded to the original infinitude of his perfections. Does any one cavil at the thought of making perfection more perfect? Let the skeptic, then, look at the incarnation, that schoolmaster from heaven, of whom reasoning pride should silently learn to wonder and adore. Even finite intelligence can perceive the aptitude of suffering, as well as of incarnation, to make perfect the divine Captain of our salvation. It was the suffering of the God which gave infinite value to his expiatory offering. It was by his own suffering that he best learned how to sympathize with suffering humanity. It was by his divine suffering that he taught the wondering hierarchies of heaven and the despairing princedoms of hell that he had become the Captain of our salvation, not in name only, but also in endurance; that his suffering and tasting of death were not figures of speech, but solemn realities.

In the sixteenth verse, it is said of the Taster



of death for every man, called, too, the Captain of our salvation, that "he took not on him the nature of angels, but he took on him the seed of Abraham." That the Taker on him of the seed of Abraham was the God, about to be made man, is beyond peradventure. He had been pre-existent; he took on him the seed of Abraham of his own free choice. He might, had he so elected, have taken on him the nature of angels. While our opponents will doubtless admit that it was the God who took on him the seed of Abraham, and that it was the God-man who became the Captain of our salvation, except in the article of suffering, they will steadfastly affirm that, in the article of suffering and the tasting of death, the actor was not the Creator, but the creature. The intelligent reader cannot but perceive how subversive this theory is of the symmetry of the whole chapter. Nor must he undervalue this startling fact. Not only every chapter, but the entire volume of the Word of God, must needs be symmetrical. From its common and divine origin, each of its diversified parts must, of necessity, harmonize with the whole. Such are the laws of the material creations of God. Such, especially, must be the law of the moral creation, revealed in his own Holy Word, indited by his own Holy Spirit. No lawless comet wanders in that system of grace. The theory, then, which, to be sustained, must bring

sacred texts into collision with each other, or with other sacred texts, cannot have come down from above.

To evince more clearly the discrepancy infused by the prevalent theory into the second chapter of Hebrews, let us, for a moment, review its three prominent truths, in the reverse order to that in which they are recorded. Its three prominent truths are the assumption of the seed of Abraham, the captainship of our salvation, and the suffering and tasting of death. In the assumption of the seed of Abraham, the God was the Actor. The man was passive ; he was only the recipient. It was the incarnation of the God. The God “manifest in the flesh” became the Captain of our salvation ; and here manhood began to act its humble part—the part of a secondary planet to the central sun, round which it is revolved. To the captainship of our salvation, suffering and death, of necessity, pertained. They were the chief purposes of the creation of the official character. It “behooved” the Captain of our salvation to suffer.—Luke, xxiv., 46. To suffer and to die was the object for which the living God became the incarnate Captain of our salvation. The Captain of our salvation was to suffer and die in all the elements which constitute his being. He was to suffer in both his natures. He was to die the

death of a mortal ; he was to die the death of an immortal. If he did not suffer and die in all the elements which formed his united being and constituted his identity, then the Captain of our salvation was never made "perfect through sufferings." The central sun would not become extinguished, or lose its lustre from the mere dissolution or derangement of its attendant planet.

On the prevalent theory, the Bible was mistaken in its asseveration that the Captain of our salvation suffered. The Bible supposed that the lightning of infinite wrath had pierced him through and through. The Bible was deceived ; it was but the rent of his outer garment. The Captain of our salvation, in the paramount and infinite element of his united being, passed scathless through the fiery deluge. It was only his subaltern, not himself, who suffered and tasted of death. The divine Captain remained cased in impassibility. If this be true, then He, who is the most disinterested of beings, would not have arrogated, or permitted his inspired disciples to arrogate for himself, the honours hard earned by the suffering and death of his devoted subaltern. In the scriptural proclamations of the struggles and triumphs of redeeming love, it would somewhere have been announced, or, at least, intimated, that it was the self-sacrificed subaltern alone who, by his suffer-

ing and death, paid the price of the world's redemption.

The second chapter of Hebrews came from the pen of its inspired writer a blessed family of harmonious truths. By the touch of the prevalent theory, its beautiful symmetry is marred. Its sacred sisters are made to use sacred words with double import, having a seeming and a covert signification. This is not the ingenuous manner in which divine truth has been wont to deal with the children of men. In its application of the same, or the like terms, to the same identical subject, in the same holy chapter, it is a stranger to duplicity of meaning.

The fourteenth verse is as follows: "Forasmuch, then, as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil." He who, with "the children," himself likewise took part of flesh and blood, was the second person of the glorious Trinity. The human son of the Virgin took not part of flesh and blood by voluntary agency. He was the passive recipient. That the second person of the Trinity assumed not incarnation from any lack of capacity to suffer in his ethereal essence, if such had been his.

holy will, has already appeared. The reasons of his selecting the garb of humanity as his suffering costume we shall attempt most reverentially to intimate in a subsequent chapter. He who, through death, was the destroyer of him who had the power of death, was the God incarnate. Was this death confined to any particular element of his united being? The prevalent theory affirms that it was limited to the little speck of his manhood. So said not the Holy Ghost. Inspiration, in designating its recipient, used terms comprehending the whole united being of the incarnate God. Human reason has no right, by the word of its power, to subtract the Godhead from this august totality, and thus to sink the subject of the conquering death from its scriptural infinitude down to a finite atom.

The last verse of this chapter reads thus: "For in that he himself hath suffered, being tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted." This was doubtless applied to the man Christ Jesus. It was also applied to the God Christ Jesus. That the whole incarnate God was for a moment "tempted" to pause in his mediatorial career by the near approach of his viewless, inexpressible, unimaginable sufferings, let the amazement, and agony, and bloody sweat, and piercing cries, and vehement supplications of Gethsemane bear witness. His

peculiar aptitude, acquired from his own personal experience, to become the efficient and divine succourer of tempted suffering, in every place and in every age, has been tested by the lapse of eighteen centuries. Does any unbelieving Thomas doubt the infinitude of this consoling truth? Let him look back to the "tempted," yet triumphant martyrdoms of the early Church. Let him trace the modern footsteps of the "tempted," yet patient and enduring missionary of the cross, on the pestilential and burning sands of Africa's physical and moral desert. Let him strengthen his morbid faith by communing with the voices that come up from the islands of the farthest seas.

That the footsteps of the mediatorial God are often apparent in the second chapter of Hebrews will not be denied by our opponents. But they will affirm that the footsteps of the mediatorial man appear still oftener; and that, in the suffering and dying scenes, the man is the sole actor. This is a just specimen of the cardinal fault of the prevalent theory in its whole representation of the character of the Messiah. Ever and anon it presents the God apart; still oftener it presents the man apart. Its scenes are perpetually changing, sometimes in the twinkling of an eye, from the Godhead to the manhood, and thence back again, as suddenly, from the manhood to the God-

head. Not so the scriptural representation. In the grand drama of the New Testament, whose author is God, and whose theme is salvation, the Godhead and the manhood of the Mediator act throughout in concert. They are one and indivisible ; separated, or capable of separation, in nothing. They are born together ; together are they wrapped in the straw of the manger. They suffer together ; together they die.



## CHAPTER XII.

Death of Eternal Son continued—Acts, iii., 15: Ye “killed the Prince of life.” 1 Corinthians, ii., 8: They “crucified the Lord of glory.” John, x., 14, 15: “I am the good shepherd.” “I lay down my life for the sheep”—The Lamb of the fifth Chapter of Revelation—John, iii., 16, 17: “For God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son.” “For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world.” Romans, viii., 32: “He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all.”

THERE is a passage in Acts, and another in Corinthians, which are kindred passages with those upon which we have been commenting in the preceding chapters. The passage in Acts stands thus: “But ye denied the Holy One, and the Just, and desired a murderer to be granted unto you; and killed the Prince of life.”—Acts, iii., 14, 15. The passage in Corinthians stands thus: “Which none of the princes of this world knew; for had they known it, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory.”—1 Corinthians, ii., 8.

Who was the “Prince of life,” the “Lord of glory,” of these passages? Doubtless it was not the mere humanity of him of Nazareth. Beyond peradventure, he whom these passages denominated the “Prince of life,” the “Lord of glory,” was



the second person of the Trinity, arrayed in his vestment of flesh. We have, then, these additional declarations of the Holy Ghost, that the second person of the Trinity, thus arrayed, was crucified and killed. These declarations must have been accomplished in all the plenitude of their awful truth. Would they have been accomplished by the crucifixion and death of the mere humanity of the Virgin's child? A man is not perforated by the perforation of his vestment. That the ethereal essence of the second person of the Trinity was distorted by the wood, and lacerated by the irons of the cross, no one will be wild enough to intimate; but that his ethereal essence endured viewless sufferings, denominated in scripture death, inflicted by the invisible sword of the Lord of Hosts, of which the visible dissolution of his terrestrial being on Calvary was but the representative, we cannot doubt, with the declarations of the Holy Ghost to that effect sounding in our ears.

The Sacred Three have, "at sundry times and in divers manners," declared, without restriction or limitation, that their second glorious person, clothed in flesh, suffered and died for the salvation of the world. Man, for whose sake this miracle of grace was wrought, yields not his credence to these stupendous declarations but with qualifica-

tions and exceptions, the creatures of his own reasoning pride, lowering their sublime truths, as it were, from heaven down to earth. What is the cause of this strange phenomenon? It is caused by the sin of unbelief, that great moral ailment of our natures. This ailment lost us paradise. It withstood the personal miracles of the Son of God. That celestial Physician could cure, by the word of his power or the touch of his hand, the physical maladies of man; but to mitigate this moral malady, he was obliged to lay down his most precious life. And even in the soul renovated by his blood, the final victory of faith over the remnant of unbelief is its last triumph. The sin of skepticism is not peculiar to the scoffing infidel; it is the evil spirit which haunts the path even of the pious Christian. It often obtrudes its "miscreated front" into the closet, whither he has retired to commune with his Redeemer; it sometimes pursues him to the very altar of his God. Regenerated man, while in this wilderness of temptation, is, alas! but a believer in part. The time, however, is at hand when his feeble, trembling, hesitating faith will be swallowed up in glorious certainty.

The following passage is specially relevant to the point in issue: "I am the good shepherd, and know my sheep, and am known of mine."—John, x., 14. "As the Father knoweth me, even so

know I the Father : and I lay down my life for the sheep.”—John, x., 15. The last verse will be considered first. The speaker, in this passage, was Christ. When he said, “As the Father knoweth me, even so know I the Father,” he must, beyond doubt, have spoken of himself in his united natures, and with special reference to his Godhead. It was only the omniscient Son who could know the Father, even as the Father knew him. “Canst thou by searching find out God ? Canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection ? It is as high as heaven ; what canst thou do ? deeper than hell ; what canst thou know ?”—Job, xi., 7, 8. These sublime interrogatories were propounded to demonstrate to feeble man his utter incapacity to explore and comprehend the mysterious and awful elements of the unsearchable God. The manhood of Christ had no greater capacity, physical or intellectual, than an ordinary man ; it had no infinitude of comprehension ; it admitted its want of prescience. The mighty speaker, then, who thus claimed community of omniscience with the Father, must have been the fellow of the Father’s everlasting reign.

“And I lay down my life for the sheep.” The speaker had two lives, the human and the divine ; the drop and the ocean of vitality ; distinct, yet united. If his meaning was that he would lay

down the human drop, leaving the divine ocean untouched, then must he have made a sudden, abrupt, and strange transition, in one brief sentence, from the altitude of his united natures, where the sentence began, down to his mere exclusive humanity. There is nothing on the face of the passage to intimate that such sudden descent was intended. Such abrupt transition is not required or indicated by anything in the context. In a verse shortly succeeding, in the same chapter, are found the memorable words, "I and my Father are one."—John, x., 30. The terms used by Christ, in the passage under review, were unlimited and illimitable. They import the laying down of both his lives. They are not satisfied with anything short of the totality. To compress them within a small fractional part of that stupendous whole, is to straiten, and distort, and maim the terms. Why will reasoning man gratuitously crucify the living, palpable, speaking words of the crucified God? Because, as the needle is true to the pole, so does unbending man implicitly follow the guidance of that hypothesis which he has adopted for his polar star, "God is impassible." Yet has it been shown that this assumed polar star, though it has hung for centuries on the skirts of the horizon, is but an exhalation of the earth.

He who laid down his "life for the sheep" des-

ignated himself by the name of the good shepherd. "I am the good shepherd." To whom was this endearing name applied? Not to the human son of Mary, but to the "Lord of glory." The human son of the Virgin was but the mansion of the good shepherd—the temple consecrated by the indwelling God. As, then, a man dieth not because his mansion is consumed; as the God is not destroyed by the destruction of the temple, so the life of the good shepherd would not have been laid down by the dissolution of his tabernacle of clay, according to the mighty meaning of the august speaker. His declarations, which so astonished the heavens, could only have been satisfied by the laying down of the divine life of the second person of the Trinity, in the scriptural import of the stupendous terms.

Christ did not leave the meaning of the term "life," as applicable to himself, to be inferred by reasoning process. Five chapters before that upon which we are commenting, he explicitly fixed its signification by his own paramount authority. "For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself."—John, v., 26. The Father's own vitality was imparted to the Son. His was the life which came down from heaven. It was the life that had breathed vitality into created intelligences. When Christ,

therefore, announced the laying down his life, he meant not merely the human drop. He included the divine ocean of being.

According to Christ's own explication of the term life, when applied to himself, the life of the incarnate Son was as the life of the Father. This authoritative explication of the term, when so applied, became a governing precedent for all future cases. Christ, then, in using the same term, with the same application to himself, five chapters afterward, intended, doubtless, to abide by his own explication and precedent. Hence we justly infer, that when he declared, "and I lay down my life for the sheep," he meant that the life which he was about to lay down was as the life of the infinite Father. It was the life, the whole united life of the incarnate God. The advocates of the prevalent theory cannot escape this conclusion, unless they are prepared to allege that the Son of God applied the term life to himself in one sense in the fifth chapter of John, and in a totally different sense in the tenth chapter of the same evangelist. But such discrepancy of meaning, in the use of a term solemnly defined by himself, and declarative of his own vitality, could scarcely have proceeded from the lips of the incarnate Word; at least, such discrepancy is not to be inferred without some scriptural intimation of its existence.

No such intimation is to be found in the volume of inspiration.

The incarnate God laid down his ethereal life, not, indeed, by its cessation even for a moment, but by sustaining, in his divine essence, the expiatory agonies substituted for the spiritual or second death that awaited the redeemed. The expiatory agonies assumed, therefore, the awful name of the penalty for which they were substituted. Inspiration aptly termed those sufferings death. The appellation commends itself to the children of men by its manifest appropriateness.

In the passage concerning the coming immolation of the Shepherd God, the pronouns "I" and "my" hold conspicuous places. The personal pronoun "I" is thrice repeated to denote the second person of the Trinity, clothed in flesh. "I am the good shepherd." "As the Father knoweth me, even so know I the Father, and I lay down my life for the sheep." Mark well the mighty terms, "*my* life." Thus applied, the little pronoun "my" acquired a meaning high as heaven and vast as the universe. It gave such exaltation to its adjunct noun as to grasp the life which "inhabiteth eternity." No person employs the name of a whole to denote one of its minute parts. Should a historian or geographer apply the pe-



cular name of a continent to designate its smallest kingdom, he would speak in language unintelligible and misleading. The terms "my life," according to their obvious and plain import, intended the whole united life of the divine speaker. If he meant merely the little spark of his mortal vitality, he must, in this case, have departed from that simplicity and perspicuity which formed so distinguishing a characteristic of him who spake as never man spake. To narrow down the terms to the mere mortal life of Mary's son would be imparting to this stupendous passage—we speak it with reverence—an illusory meaning. It would make the passage, though infinite in seeming and profession, finite only in its real purpose; finite only in its fulfilment.

The Lamb of the fifth chapter of Revelation was certainly Christ. That Lamb had been slain. That glorious Lamb of God had two natures, the human and the divine. And had he, indeed, been slain but in one of them, and that, too, his inferior nature? The scene of this sublime chapter was laid in the celestial court. The Lamb, having just taken from the right hand of him who sat upon the throne the sealed book, had opened its seals, when straightway there ascended a "new song" of praise and thanksgiving, perhaps louder and more heartfelt than even heaven had been



wont to hear, beginning around the throne of the Highest, and echoed back by "every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth!" For whom did this unwonted shout ascend? It was raised to the glory of the Lamb. And why? Because he had been slain for the redemption of the saints. That was the reason specially assigned. And would the mere slaying of his human nature, the mere extinction of his mortal life, have been thus assigned by the hierarchies of heaven as a special reason for raising higher than, perhaps, it had ever been raised before, the pealing anthem of the universe!—Revelation, v., 7–14.

Christ, while on earth, said, "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved."—John, iii., 16, 17. And the Holy Spirit, by the lips of one of his inspired apostles, says still more expressively, "He" (meaning God) "that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?"—Romans, viii., 32.

That the Being designated in these passages by

the name of God was the first person of the Trinity will not be questioned. "And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father."—John, i., 14. Who was "the only begotten of the Father," "sent" "into the world," and "spared not," styled, in one of the passages forming the last paragraph, God's "own Son," by way of distinction and pre-eminence, and in the other "his only-begotten Son?" Clearly, he was not the human son of the Virgin. Mary's human offspring was not the "only-begotten Son" of the infinite Father. Nor did the infinite Father beget him. The conception of the Virgin was by the power of the Holy Ghost.—Luke, i., 35.

In the thirteenth verse of the same third chapter of John, it is declared that the Son of the Father, there called the Son of man, "came down from heaven." And in one of the transcribed passages it is stated, as we have seen, that he was "sent" "into the world." But the human son of the Virgin never "came down from heaven," at least before his ascension. Nor was he "sent" "into the world." It was in the world that he was created. It was in the manger of Bethlehem that he first came into being. He had no antecedent existence.

It is demonstrated, then, that God's "own Son," his "only-begotten Son," his Son who "came down from heaven," his Son "sent" "into the world," and "spared not," was none other than the second person of the Trinity. It was not the mortal progeny of Mary—earth-born and earth-composed in the elements of his humanity—that formed the glowing theme of the Holy Ghost in these stupendous passages. He spoke of his own brother God as the unspared Son of the Father. The unspared Son was he by whom the Father created the worlds, the hierarchies of heaven, the dwellers upon earth. The unspared Son was the Son who had sat at his Father's right hand, and shared in his councils from the earliest eternity.

For what purpose did the infinite Father send into the world "his own," "his only-begotten Son?" It was not that he might explore this remote province of his Father's boundless empire. It was not that he might make a pleasant sojourn on this goodly earth. The Son of God was sent into the world to suffer. Suffering was the object, the great object of his mission. He came, not to impart dignity and value to the human sufferings of his earthly associate, but to suffer himself; to suffer, not by proxy or substitute, but in his own divine person. Infinite wisdom, indeed, thought it best that he should suffer in the fallen

nature he came to redeem. But that was only the garb in which he appeared. His manhood was but the adjunct; his divinity was the principal. He came to suffer, not in his adjunct nature only, but also in his principal nature. He came to make, not a seeming and illusory, but a real atonement for the sins of man. That venerated common law, which our fathers brought from our fatherland with their language, their liberties, and their religion, is encumbered with many fictions, which, for the supposed furtherance of justice, it regards as truths. The divine law deals not in fiction. In its administration of universal justice, in its penal code, in its punishment of incorrigible sinners, in its pardons to the penitent, all is reality. Its celestial city for the abode of the blessed is no fiction. Its great and everlasting prison-house is no fiction. In the passion of Christ there was nothing of fiction.

The passage transcribed from Romans contains terms not surpassed in awful import by any words written in any of the tongues of earth. God "spared not his own Son!" The infinite Father "spared not" his own infinite Son! We have seen that the unspared victim was the second person of the Trinity. One of the Sacred Three would not have termed his kindred God the unspared of the Father, had he carried along with him his

divine beatitude, in all its infinite perfection, from the throne of heaven to the manger of Bethlehem, and from the manger of Bethlehem to the tomb of Joseph. Had the throes and spasms by which salvation was earned touched not the ethereal essence of the incarnate God ; had his Godhead continued as blissful on earth as it had ever been in heaven ; had the expiatory agonies devolved exclusively on his terrestrial adjunct, the uncreated, the eternal Son would have been the spared, and not the unspared of his Father. It would have been only the human son of Mary whom the infinite Father "spared not." Yet the declaration that the devoted victim was "spared not," rendered, by the very simplicity of its terms, lucid as the sunbeam, is applied by the Holy Ghost directly to the Father's "own Son ;" and, by necessary inference, to his "only-begotten Son ;" to his Son "who came down from heaven ;" to his Son who was "sent" "into the world."

It was when the infinite Father inflicted on the divine spirit of "his own," "his only-begotten Son," made a voluntary curse for those he came to save, "the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God," that the tremendous declaration of the Holy Ghost was accomplished. The Father "spared not his own Son." True, that Son had been the fellow of his everlasting reign, with whom he had

taken "sweet counsel" ere time was known, yet the Father spared him not. True, the paternal heart yearned with throes, to which the silent, though deep emotions of the faithful Abraham were but as the finite to the infinite; yet the Father "spared not his own Son." True, the angelic hosts, if permitted to behold the appalling spectacle, must have cast their dismayed, their deprecatory, their beseeching eyes now on the descending arm, now on the stern, though still benignant face of the Ancient of Days, yet the infinite Father spared not his own infinite Son. True, the uncomplaining, the submissive, the unoffending Son, "brought as a lamb to the slaughter," presented, in his own meek and gentle form, an appeal to parental sympathy, almost enough to make even divine justice "break its sword," yet the Father spared him not. This was indeed the magnanimity of a God! This "became Him for whom are all things, and by whom are all things!" It became the First who bears "record in heaven;" it became the august Ancient of Days; it became the infinite Father. This was the sublime mode, devised in the conclave of the Godhead, for "bringing many sons unto glory."—Hebrews, ii., 10. The sacrifice was not delusive; the Holy Trinity never delude. It was an awful reality, not an Oriental metaphor.

The prevailing theory, that Christ suffered only

in his humanity, must sink, as the stone sinks in the deep, under the overwhelming weight of the passage from Romans, unless its advocates can, by their interpretation, so amend that part of Holy Writ as to make it read thus: God spared not the human nature of his own Son! But at such an interpolation of the word of God the devout advocates of the prevalent theory would themselves stand appalled.



## CHAPTER XIII.

Dismay and Perturbation of Christ before and during last Passion—His Apprehensions and Conduct contrasted with Human Martyrs, and Persons not Martyrs—Phenomenon not explicable on Supposition that Humanity alone suffered—Reasons commonly assigned for his Dismay and Perturbation, and Fallacy of such Reasons.

THE dismay with which Christ beheld his coming sufferings, and the perturbation which their endurance caused him, can only be explained on the supposition that the sufferings were not confined to his human nature. Had the primitive Christian martyrs exhibited the same dismay and perturbation at the approach of death, one of the chief arguments in favour of the truth of our holy religion would have been lost to the world. The patience, fortitude, and triumph with which they met and endured the excruciating agonies of martyrdom ranked high among the miracles by which early Christianity was propagated. "See how a Christian can die!" is an appeal to infidelity not of modern origin. Its thrilling effect was well known and felt in the early Church. The triumphant death of the first martyrs was among the most eloquent of the addresses ever made by Christianity to the pagan world. It was a miracle, per-

haps, more touching to the heart than the healing of the sick or the raising of the dead.

The corporeal sufferings of many of the early martyrs were, doubtless, greater than the corporeal sufferings of their Master. His was the case, so far as the body was concerned, of simple crucifixion. They were stoned to death with stones ; they were consumed by slow fires ; their flesh was torn off with red-hot pincers ; they were sawed asunder with saws ; they were drawn to pieces by wild beasts ; the cross was, indeed, often the instrument of their death, but to them was not allowed the comparative repose of simple crucifixion. Its abhorrence of the rising and hated sect of the Nazarenes had sharpened the devices of heathen cruelty ; new discoveries were made in the art of tormenting ; new and more agonizing positions of the suffering body were contrived ; the process of torture was rendered more slow, and the welcomed approach of death more lingering. To all this variety of agonies, the timid frailty of woman, as well as the bolder hardihood of man, was almost daily subjected. But nothing could disturb the patience, the fortitude, the serenity of the primitive martyrs. Whether belonging to the more robust or the more tender sex, they yielded not for a moment to the recoilings or misgivings of human frailty ; they rejoiced in the

midst of their dying spasms, and their last, faltering accents whispered joy.

The difference between these martyrs and their Master in meeting and enduring the agonies of a violent death is an historic fact not to be passed over unnoticed. It is not a point of literary curiosity alone ; it deeply concerns our faith. It indicates that his suffering must have differed from theirs, not only in its degree, but in its very element. Contrast, for instance, the death of Stephen with that of his Lord ; look at the face of the former, shining “ as it had been the face of an angel,” and then turn your melting eye to the “ marred visage” of the latter ; listen to the joyous exclamation of the finite martyr, when he saw through the opening heavens the glory of God, and Jesus standing at the right hand of the Highest ; and then lend your sympathizing ear to the wailing of Him who hung on the cross, and belief will ripen into conviction that, while the sufferer whose clothes were laid down at the feet of Saul sustained the pains of a man, the Sufferer on Calvary endured pangs pertaining only to infinitude.

In farther proof of the correctness of this conclusion, let us direct our attention to the enthusiastic exclamations of this same Saul, baptized of the Holy Ghost by the name of Paul, when nearly

approaching his own martyrdom. "For," says he, "I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith. Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me at that day."—2 Timothy, iv., 6–8. And with these eloquent bursts of exulting faith pealing in our ears, let our souls kneel down beside our prostrate Lord, on the cold, hard earth of Gethsemane, and become the astounded auditors of his piteous cry, "O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me."—Matthew, xxvi., 39.

Even without the sustaining power of religion, the resolved mind has often met and endured, without dismay, the utmost suffering of which humanity can be made the heir. The Roman Regulus returned of his own free choice to Carthage, though he well knew that, to the violent death which awaited him there, Punic cruelty and Punic cunning would superadd the severest tortures that history had ever suggested or fiction shadowed forth. And when the Africans had cut off his eyelids, and exposed his naked and lacerated eyes to their scorching sands and burning sun until their patience was exhausted; when they had rolled about his naked person in a barrel filled

with sharp spikes, pointed inward, to pierce and tear his quivering flesh, until tardy death came at last to his relief, they could no more disturb the fortitude of the hero than they could have shaken Atlas from its everlasting base. Yet was Regulus but a heathen patriot. Nor is the Western Indian chief, tied by his captors to a tree in his native forests, and encompassed round with dry materials, just lighted by the fires which are to consume him, less firm and immoveable. The taunts of his tormentors and the searching flames are alike impotent to disturb his serenity. Not a groan is uttered; not a sigh is breathed. The last, the only sound that escapes him is his shout of triumph.

The dismay with which the Son of God anticipated his sufferings, and the perturbation which their endurance caused him, have been, for more than eighteen centuries, the wonder of Christendom. On this phenomenon the eyes of all beholders have been riveted by their own spontaneous and irrepressible reflections. For where is the man to be found with "soul so dead" that, with the full assurance of the "joy set before," and the influences sustaining the man Christ Jesus—an assurance made doubly sure by successive miracles, by audible and repeated voices from heaven, by the upholding consciousness of indwelling omnip-

otence—would not himself willingly endure all the human suffering of which the incarnate God could have been the recipient? Even for the bawble of an earthly crown, what privations, what toils, what scorching sands, what snow-capped heights, what “most disastrous chances,” what “hair-breadth ’scapes in the imminent, deadly breach,” have not been joyously encountered! Compared, then, with a celestial diadem, a rank above the cherubim and the seraphim, a seat at the right hand of the Highest, made sure and everlasting by the guarantee of the Godhead, how slight and evanescent would seem all the ills that, in the brief span of a single life, could be poured into the cup of humanity, even if unceasingly filled to overflowing!

But one solution can be given of the strange phenomenon of Christ’s dismay and perturbation. His sufferings were not the mere sufferings of humanity. They must have had their chief seat within the hitherto unapproachable pavilion of his Godhead. The brightest intellects, deeply schooled in the science of logic, and armed with the treasures of profane and sacred lore, have laboured for centuries to explain the mysterious indications on principles familiar to human nature. They have utterly failed; and the failure is a farther confirmation of the justness of our supposition, that the sufferings of Christ penetrated the

sanctuary of his divinity. A brief review of the causes to which human ingenuity has attributed the dismay and perturbation of the incarnate God will best evince their utter insufficiency to produce the stupendous effects attributed to them.

First. The advocates of the prevalent theory have assigned, as one cause of his dismay and perturbation, the new and more vivid views of the heinousness of sin suddenly impressed on him at the time of his last passion. This suggestion has the high authority of Bishop Burnett. The reverend, and learned, and eloquent Doctor South speaks thus of Christ's last passion: "What thought can reach or tongue express what our Saviour then felt within his own breast! The image of all the sins of the world, for which he was to suffer, then appeared clear, and lively, and express to his mind. All the vile and horrid circumstances of them stood (as it were) particularly ranged before his eyes, in all their dismal colours. He saw how much the honour of the great God was abused by them, and how many millions of poor souls they must inevitably have cast under the pressures of a wrath infinite and intolerable, should he not have turned the blow upon himself, the horror of which then filled and amazed his vast apprehensive soul; and those apprehensions could not but affect his tender heart, then brimful of the high-



est zeal for God's glory and the most relenting compassion for the souls of men, till it fermented and boiled over with transport and agony, and even forced its way through all his body in those strange ebullitions of blood not to be paralleled by the sufferings of any person recorded in any history whatsoever."\*

We might dismiss this assigned cause of Christ's dismay and perturbation with the passing remark, that it is nowhere intimated in the Bible ; but other materials for its refutation, ample and conclusive, are at hand. The God Christ Jesus, before he left his heavenly home, had been fully conscious of the heinousness of sin. He was the being sinned against. He had come down from heaven to offer himself a sacrifice for sin. His omniscience could learn nothing new on earth of its frightful nature. The man Christ Jesus had been early taught the heinousness of sin by his own holy reflections. He had learned it from the audible discourses and the secret monitions of the indwelling God. And if he saw its heinousness more clearly at the time of his last passion, he must then also have felt more strongly the necessity of that atonement of which his humanity was the vehicle, to rescue from the pollution and penalty of sin the host of the redeemed. It is the ex-

\* South's Sermons, vol. iii., p. 348, 349.

tremity of his country's danger, forcibly presented to the mental vision of the patriot, that best sustains his exulting resolution to die in its behalf.

There is no reason for supposing that a near view of sin, to which the beholder is himself a stranger, can disturb the felicity of a holy being. Gabriel has, doubtless, a sense of sin more vivid than humanity ever attained. And yet Gabriel, with his joyous harp, still stands "in the presence of God." The humanity of Christ is glorified and blissful in heaven. Its sense of sin acquired on earth, however clear, must have grown clearer in the light of eternity. Yet this sense of sin, instead of impairing its bliss, opens wider and more enrapturing views of the grace and glory of its kindred God, and swells louder its pealing anthem of praise and thanksgiving for his redeeming love.

Secondly. It has been said that more affecting views of the countless multitudes who would reject his salvation, and of their consequent and eternal perdition, must have pressed upon the mind of Christ at the time of his last passion, and that these views enhanced the agonies of the garden and of the cross. This cause of dismay and perturbation seems to be countenanced by Doctor South. It is sanctioned by the still higher name of Archbishop Secker, once primate of all Eng-

land. But it is utterly destitute of scriptural authority. The God Christ Jesus knew, from the beginning, who would reject his proffered salvation. He always knew that he himself would one day pronounce their final doom with an unfaltering tongue and an unyielding heart.

The man Christ Jesus had been early taught by the indwelling God that "strait is the gate and narrow the way which leads to life, and few there are who find it." And as the fate of the finally impenitent caught his pitying eye, he might well repose on the consoling reflection, that the Judge of all the earth would do right. It is a blessed provision of the Father of mercies, that the sufferings of the incorrigibly wicked are not permitted to impair the felicity of holy beings. If this were not so, the songs of heaven might be saddened by the wailings of the pit. If this were not so, the bliss of the sainted Abraham might have been disturbed, at least for the moment, by the pathetic appeal of his luxurious and lost descendant for a drop of water to cool his burning tongue.

Thirdly. It has been said that the agony which Christ foresaw with such dismay, and met with such perturbation, was caused, in a great measure, by the privation of the light of his Father's countenance. If it were understood that this privation

reached the God Christ Jesus, it would indeed go far to explain the mysteries of Gethsemane and of Calvary. But our opponents cannot for a moment admit that it was the divinity of Christ that was thus forsaken of the Father ; for that would at once concede that his divinity suffered ; it would be giving up the point at issue between them and us. Upon the prevalent theory, the God Christ Jesus, in the garden and on the cross, beheld his Father's countenance lit up with the same benignant smile which had been wont to greet him in the courts of paradise.

But even to the man Christ Jesus it was no slight privation that he underwent, though but for a few brief hours, the hidings of his Father's face. The pious soul, accustomed to bask in the sunshine of heavenly love, experiences, from the sensation of its temporary loss, an anguish of which the world cannot judge. But the sting of the suffering is the sufferer's consciousness that his own sins have interposed the cloud between him and heaven. David felt this calamity, and its terrible cause, rankling in the central recesses of his heart.

Christ suffered, the "just for the unjust." He well knew his own spotless innocence. When his heavenly Father seemed to forsake him, he knew that it was for the sins of others, not for any de-

merits of his own. He doubted not that he was in the plain path of duty, however arduous and rugged. He knew that, if the light of his Father's countenance was for a brief space withdrawn, it was only the temporary absence of a beloved friend, who was sure to love him the better for being absent. And yet his fortitude seemed about to forsake him with his God ! An eclipse has no terrors to him who knows that it is caused only by the intervention of an opaque body between him and the central luminary, that is ever ready to shed on him anew its enlightening, warming, and cheering rays the moment the obstruction has passed away. Christ indeed suffered under a temporary eclipse of the light of his Father's face ; but he well knew that it was the opaque body of others' sins which alone caused the brief obstruction that a few short hours would remove forever.

Besides his consciousness of perfect innocence, Christ had other supports never before or since known in the history of suffering. He knew that he must conquer in the struggle ; that the united Godhead stood pledged for his triumph. To him victory was a matter, not of faith, but of knowledge. He knew, too, that the contest would be short ; that he should speedily rise from the dead. He was conscious that the reward of his sufferings would be an everlasting crown ; that his

place between the two thieves would be exchanged for the right hand of God ; that he would leave the tomb of Joseph for the throne of heaven. He knew that he should "see of the travail of his soul," and "be satisfied ;" that his blood would save from perdition countless millions of fallen immortals ; that his sufferings would fill the kingdom of righteousness with the joyous sons and daughters of salvation, evermore raising the song of thanksgiving to him their Saviour King. It was a cherished axiom of ancient patriotism, that it was sweet to die for one's country. How much more self-sustaining the Godlike thought of dying for a world ! This was the "joy set before him." For this he might well have "endured the cross, despising the shame."—Hebrews, xii., 2.

Fourthly. The pouring out of the wrath of God against sin on the human soul of Christ, as the substitute for sinners, is assigned as another, and the principal cause of his dismay and perturbation. This outpouring on his human soul, and its loss of the light of the divine countenance, and its views of the heinousness of sin, and its sympathy in the fate of the finally impenitent, added to the corporeal pangs of Christ, are deemed, by the advocates of the prevalent theory, sufficient, when taken collectively, to explain the phenomena of his last passion. We admit, indeed, that the human-

ity of Christ participated in his sufferings to the extent of its very limited capacity. But besides the plain scriptural indications that his divinity also suffered, we lay it down as a principle, based on the inflexible laws of our nature, that the body and human soul of Christ had not physical capabilities to become the recipient of the amount of sufferings demonstrated by the dismay with which he beheld their approach, and the perturbation which their endurance caused him. Before, however, we enter into the development of this principle, it is necessary that we should review the indications of his dismay and perturbation a little more in detail than we have hitherto done. We shall then be the better able to pursue the development of the principle which we have laid down.

## R



## CHAPTER XIV.

Calvary—Contrast between Christ and penitent Thief—Gethsemane—Speaker and Actor was Christ in both Natures—Sufferings there those of Anticipation—Indications of Dismay—It was the Anticipation of Spiritual, not Physical Agonies—Thrice-repeated Prayer—Appearance of Angel—“My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death”—What the dreaded Cup was.

IF we cast our eyes towards Calvary, we behold there the incarnate God suspended on the cross, and by his side the penitent thief. From the latter, it is not intimated that any cry of distress arose. He was just tasting the bliss of sins forgiven. He was to be that day in paradise; and what cared he for the intervening moments of pain? Of the laceration of his quivering flesh his rapt spirit was no longer conscious. The present was lost in the glorious vision of the future. To him the cross was a bed of down. But from the incarnate God, though suffering no greater corporeal pains than the penitent thief, cries loud, plaintive, and repeated arose. He knew that he also was to be that day in paradise; but to him the beatitude of heaven seemed, for the moment, obscured by the agonies of earth. Over his drooping spirit the seraphic future appeared, for the time, to be lost in the present—the ab-

sorbing, the all-devouring present. What caused this mighty contrast between the indications of suffering displayed by the frail creature and the omnipotent Creator? But one solution can be found. The penitent thief bore the pains of a man; Christ endured the agonies of a God. Had the sting of death been pointed at his humanity alone, the cross would have been anticipated with delight and met with triumph. The struggle on Calvary would have been hailed as the joyous termination of his vicarious privations and sufferings; the blissful hour of his deliverance from the heavy curse of others' sins; the glorious epoch of his return to his Father's arms, crowned with the laurels of a world redeemed.

But if we would gain deeper views of the dismay and perturbation of our Lord, let us meet him at the Garden of Gethsemane. The occurrences of the garden, so far as they relate to our present purpose, are thus related by St. Matthew: "And he took with him Peter, and the two sons of Zebedee, and began to be sorrowful and very heavy. Then saith he unto them, My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death: tarry ye here and watch with me. And he went a little farther, and fell on his face, and prayed, saying, O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me; nevertheless, not as I will, but as thou wilt.

And he cometh unto the disciples, and findeth them asleep, and saith unto Peter, What! could ye not watch with me one hour? Watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation: the spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak. He went away again the second time, and prayed, saying, O my Father, if this cup may not pass away from me, except I drink of it, thy will be done. And he came and found them asleep again; for their eyes were heavy. And he left them, and went away again, and prayed the third time, saying the same words."—Matthew, xxvi., 37, and the verses following.

The narrative of St. Mark is in the following words: "And he taketh with him Peter, and James, and John, and began to be sore amazed, and to be very heavy; and saith unto them, My soul is exceeding sorrowful unto death: tarry ye here and watch. And he went forward a little, and fell on the ground and prayed, that if it were possible, the hour might pass from him. And he said, Abba, Father, all things are possible unto thee; take away this cup from me; nevertheless, not what I will, but what thou wilt. And he cometh, and findeth them sleeping, and saith unto Peter, Simon, sleepest thou? couldst not thou watch one hour? Watch ye and pray, lest ye enter into temptation. The spirit truly is ready, but the

flesh is weak. And again he went away, and prayed and spake the same words. And when he returned he found them asleep again (for their eyes were heavy); neither wist they what to answer him. And he cometh the third time, and saith unto them, Sleep on now, and take your rest: it is enough; the hour is come; behold, the Son of man is betrayed into the hands of sinners."—Mark, xiv., 33, and following verses.

St. Luke adds the following essential particulars to the narration: "And there appeared an angel unto him from heaven, strengthening him. And being in an agony, he prayed more earnestly; and his sweat was as it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground."—Luke, xxii., 43, 44.

We have thus transcribed, in connexion, the substance of the several evangelical accounts of the occurrences at Gethsemane, that the mind might take in at one view the stupendous whole. We cannot deem the garden forbidden ground. It is, indeed, a holy place. On entering it, we would lay aside the rough-soled sandals of controversy. We would even cast the shoes from our feet, as we tread the soil bedewed by the tears and wet with the blood of the redeeming God. Yet was the affecting scene revealed for the edi-

fication of man. "All scripture was given by divine inspiration, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness."—2 Timothy, iii., 16. Had it not been intended for human meditation, it would have found no place in the Bible. The prevalent theory has locked up the sacred pages in which it is portrayed in seemingly inextricable mystery. To unlock those precious pages there is but one key. Our comments on this memorable scene will be arranged under several heads.

First. The speaker and actor in the garden was the God incarnate ; he was the Christ ; the whole Christ of the Bible. The notion sometimes intimated, that the indwelling Deity, at the approach of the last passion, retired from the impending conflict, has no foundation in scripture. The emotions displayed were not the mere outbreakings of human frailty. It was the incarnate God who was sorrowful, and amazed, and agonized. To limit the sorrow, and amazement, and agony to his manhood alone would be casting into the shade, on the scriptural canvass, the figure of the infinite Creator, and giving the prominent place to the finite creature.

Secondly. The anguish of Gethsemane was caused by the anticipation of some impending

and appalling evil. As yet pain had not touched the incarnate God, save the privations, and hardships, and revilings which had marked every footstep of his suffering life. The "cup of trembling" was prospective. It was not yet tasted. It was its anticipation which, for the time, seemingly overwhelmed the God "manifest in the flesh."

Thirdly. Against these anticipated evils the incarnate Deity was fortified by almighty influences, peculiar and unique. Innocence cheered his heart; heaven lent its most soothing sympathies; the united Godhead exerted its utmost energies to sustain him; yet was Gethsemane filled with dismay and perturbation, the like of which time, in its flight of six thousand years, has not beheld. The Lord of glory, in his vestments of clay, cast himself upon the ground, his face in the dust, and his body wet with a bloody sweat. His soul was exceedingly sorrowful, even unto death; he was sore amazed; his agony was inexpressible, unimaginable. Human innocence never stood thus aghast at the prospect of approaching ills. The sentenced culprit, with death and hell full before him, though his trembling knees may have smitten against each other as did those of Belshazzar, never sweat through the pores of his healthful body "great drops of blood falling down to the ground."

Fourthly. The visible and mortal pains of Calvary had little influence in heightening the awful pangs of the garden. The near view of its revilings, its buffetings, its scourgings, its crown of thorns, even the nails of its cross, would not have moved the serenity of an early Christian martyr. If they dwelt at all on the mind of the incarnate God, amid the tossings of Gethsemane, they must have seemed to him less than the scarce perceptible ripples caused by the summer zephyr compared to ocean ploughed by the wintry tempest. His astonished gaze was directed beyond the veil which limited mortal vision. There he beheld agonies awaiting him which no human eye could have seen and lived, which human language wants words to express, and which the human imagination cannot soar high enough to conceive—agonies which his manhood had not dimensions capacious enough to contain, any more than a vessel formed by a potter of the earth could contain the illimitable sea.

Fifthly. The thrice-repeated prayer of the garden ascended from the lips of that august Being who had thought it no robbery to be equal with God; it was pronounced by that almighty voice which had commanded the winds and the waves, and they obeyed. With face prone on the cold ground, and body quivering with nameless an-



guish, did the only-begotten, the uncreated, the divine, the incarnated Son utter the piercing cry, "O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me." To drink this very cup he had come into the world. Of this fearful cup he had often spoken. From his contemplation it had never been absent. Had the cup passed from him, the sole purpose of his incarnation would have been frustrated. The universe must have beheld the strange spectacle of a God attempting to redeem by his sufferings a ruined race, and failing in the attempt for want of fortitude to suffer.

Yet, true it is, that, when the dismaying cup was just at hand, the resolution of the incarnate Deity seemed, for a moment, to falter. The piteous cry ascended, wafted upward by more than earthly fervour. The cry, and its fervour, too, are engraved on the Bible's imperishable record, pointing with demonstrative certainty to the awful conclusion, that a single drop from that cup of almighty wrath must have scorched into annihilation the vital elements of the loftiest being ever created by the word of the Highest. That the infinite, the world-redeeming Son, in a moment superadded the pathetic qualification, "Nevertheless, not as I will, but as thou wilt," while it denotes the patient meekness of him who was "brought as a lamb to the slaughter," derogates

nothing from the tremendous character of that impending cup, of which none but a God could have drank.

Sixthly. "And there appeared an angel unto him from heaven, strengthening him." To whom did the angel appear? It appeared "unto him." The pronoun "him" is twice used in this passage, and the context demonstrates that, in each instance, it was used to designate the Christ, the whole Christ. The angel then appeared, not merely to the human son of the Virgin, but unto the united being of the incarnate God. For what purpose did the "angel appear unto him?" The Holy Ghost has informed us. It was to strengthen him. There is no intimation that the angel appeared merely to strengthen the manhood of Christ. The declaration is general, pervading, according to its plain signification, every recess of the united natures of the God "manifest in the flesh." The declaration would be cramped and maimed if withdrawn from the infinitude of his united being, to which it properly appertains, and compressed into the finite speck of his humanity. Can reasoning pride erect itself into a court of review to expand, abridge, or qualify, by its own discretion, the explicit phraseology of the third person of the Trinity?

Perhaps reasoning pride may deem it strange and improbable, and therefore not to be believed,

even on the word of the Holy Ghost, that an angel should appear to strengthen the omnipotent God. If reasoning pride is thus presumptuously arrogant, it may as well aim at consistence in its arrogance. Let it, then, if it dare, seek, by its rash skepticism, to blot out from scriptural theology the stupendous article of the incarnation. The incarnation was the wonder of wonders. That very God should become very flesh, and verily dwell among us, is surely not less strange than that an angel from heaven should appear unto the incarnate God, "strengthening him."

The manhood of the Virgin's son needed, ordinarily, no strengthening from above. Its Creator dwelt within ; its guardian, its guide, its protector ; almighty, never sleeping, ever ready to succour his frail terrestrial companion. To that humanity the indwelling Deity was wedded, and the marriage tie was to be lasting as the right hand throne of the Eternal. Though a woman may forget her sucking child, "that she should not have compassion on the son of her womb," yet could not the incarnate and compassionate God fail to listen to every sigh, and count every tear, and remember, as though they had been graven "upon the palms of his hands," all the weaknesses, and pains, and fears of that feeble humanity, which he had adopted as his own, and, as it were, incorporated into

himself. While the strength of the incarnate Deity remained unimpaired, there was no need that there should appear unto the human son of the Virgin an angel from heaven, "strengthening him."

It is true that the created angel had no strength of his own to impart to his Creator. But he bore greetings from the court of heaven. He was the ambassador of the holy Trinity, fraught with every soothing, "strengthening" consideration which could flow from the wisdom and love of the Godhead. It is true that the omnipresent and omniscient Father might doubtless have communicated directly with his omnipresent and omniscient Son. So he might with the prophets and patriarchs of the olden time. But the Father had been wont to communicate with the dwellers upon earth through the instrumentality of ministering spirits. That it seemed wisest to the infinitely wise that an angel from heaven should bear the communication from above to the suffering God at Gethsemane, if it cannot satisfy, should at least silence the cavils of reasoning pride.

The infinite Father, from his exalted throne, beheld his only-begotten, his well-beloved Son struggling in the garden. He saw him "sorrowful, even unto death;" he saw him "sore amazed;"

he beheld him, being in an agony, "sweat as it were great drops of blood, falling down to the ground;" he heard his pathetic cry, "O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me;" he saw that even his infinite and omnipotent Son, now made a curse for sin, was almost ready to sink under its more than mountain weight: and it was therefore that "there appeared an angel unto him from heaven, strengthening him."

Seventhly. "My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death." The true meaning of the original Greek word, rendered by our translators "soul," becomes here a subject of interest. The divine speaker had a material and immaterial nature. Within his body were lodged a human soul, and that ethereal essence, which constituted the second person of the Trinity; the former bearing to the latter the same proportion as the finite bears to the infinite. The original word, here translated soul, when applied to ordinary men, means the immaterial, breathing, living principle within them. The term finds, within the common children of humanity, no other aliment. But if applied to subjects affording other aliment for its sustenance, then the term spontaneously expands itself, so as to embrace the whole indwelling immateriality, however vast it may be. Plato had received, through the channels of tradition, some few scat-

tered rays of that divine light which, in early ages, had been communicated to man. These rays he carefully concentrated, and was thus enabled to form a theory which advanced one incipient step towards the glorious system of revealed truth. He darkly conceived the outlines of an immaterial, omnipresent, omniscient God, the creator and preserver of the heavens and the earth. To denote this ethereal essence, this immaterial, viewless, living principle, pervading and animating the immeasurable universe, the Athenian philosopher employed the identical Greek word with which the evangelists, Matthew and Mark, have opened their narratives of the pathetic wailings of their Lord in the garden, and which has been rendered soul by our translators.

When Christ said at Gethsemane, "My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death," he must have intended to declare that his whole immaterial or spiritual nature was overwhelmed with sorrow. He intimated no distinction between the human and divine portions of his immaterial or spiritual being. He used a general term, applicable to both ; a term not technically confined to the human soul ; a term comprehensive enough to include his divine as well as his human immateriality ; a term which the great master of the Greek tongue had employed to denote the divine

essence. When, therefore, reasoning pride seeks to narrow down the term thus used by Christ, so as to confine its meaning to the inferior part of his immaterial or spiritual being, bearing a less proportion to the whole than a single grain of sand bears to the vast earth we inhabit, it seeks to render particular that awful declaration which the Son of God left general. To make the point clearer, let us suppose that the translators, instead of the present version, had translated the passages in question so as to make them conform, in terms, to the limited meaning now sought to be attached to them, by inserting the adjective human before the substantive soul. The exclamation of Christ would then have stood thus: "My human soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death." This version would doubtless have been startling, even to the advocates of the prevalent theory. But if the adjective "human" is to be insinuated into the passages by construction, it might better have been openly inserted by the pen.

What were the contents of the cup, whose mere anticipation caused the sorrow, and amazement, and agony of the garden, the human imagination has not powers to conceive. It was the "cup of trembling," filled to overflowing with the "fierceness and wrath of Almighty God." The visible agonies of Calvary doubtless bore no com-



parison to those which were unseen. The real tragedy was behind the curtain. There, impervious to human vision, was perfected the spiritual crucifixion of the eternal Son of God. The body of Christ heeded not the scourgings of the soldiery, but his whole immaterial being writhed under the anguish of those stripes by which we are healed. He looked down with indifference on the vindictive gaze of the crucifying multitude ; but he looked upward with dismay at his Father's altered face. Through the opening skies he beheld that countenance, which, until he became a curse for us, had forever beamed on him with the sunshine of heaven, now darkened with a frown. The draught of mingled vinegar and gall he could reject ; but now made sin, though sinless, he was compelled to drain to the very dregs the terrible cup of infinite wrath. The nails of the cross, which lacerated his quivering flesh, he regarded not ; but he felt, in all the elements of his spiritual natures, that invisible, yet flaming sword of the Lord of Hosts, which was piercing him through and through, as the substitute for sinners.

But the scene was about to close. The last cry was ascending from the cross. "It is finished !" exclaimed the dying God, and gave up the ghost. "It is finished !" was echoed through the courts of heaven with triumphant acclamations. "It is fin-

ished!" was reverberated through the vaults of hell in tones of despair. What was finished? The throes and spasms of a suffering Deity were finished. The reconciliation of infinite justice and infinite mercy was finished. The everlasting triumph over the powers of darkness was finished. The redemption of a world was finished.

We close this chapter by presenting to our readers the remarks of one of the master-spirits of the age on the extent and nature of Christ's sufferings. The remarks first reached our knowledge after these sheets were prepared for the press. The great and pious Chalmers says, "It blunts the gratitude of men when they think lightly of the sacrifice which God had to make when he gave up his Son unto the death; and, akin to this pernicious imagination, our gratitude is farther deadened and made dull when we think lightly of the death itself. This death was an equivalent for the punishment of guilty millions. In the account which is given of it, we behold all the symptoms of a deep and dreadful endurance—of an agony which was shrunk from, even by the Son of God, though he had all the strength of the Divinity to uphold him—of a conflict, and a terror, and a pain, under which omnipotence itself had wellnigh given way, and which, while it proved that the strength of the sufferer was infi-

nite, proved that the sin for which he suffered, in its guilt and in its evil, was infinite also. Christ made not a seeming, but a substantial atonement for the sins of the world. There was something more than an ordinary martyrdom. There was an actual laying on of the iniquities of us all ; and, however little we are fitted for diving into the mysteries of the divine jurisprudence—however obscurely we know of all that was felt by the Son of God when the dreadful hour and power of darkness were upon him, yet we may be well assured that it was no mockery ; that something more than the mere representation of a sacrifice, it was most truly and essentially a sacrifice itself—a full satisfaction rendered for the outrage that had been done upon the Lawgiver—his whole authority vindicated, the entire burden of his wrath discharged. This is enough for all the moral purposes that are to be gained by our faith in Christ's propitiation. It is enough that we know of the travail of his soul. It is enough that he exchanged places with the world he died for, and that what to us would have been the wretchedness of eternity, was all concentrated upon him, and by him was fully borne.”\*

\* Chalmers's Lectures on Romans, p. 318, 319. Carter's New-York edition.

## CHAPTER XV.

Humanity of Christ had not Physical Capacities to endure all his Sufferings—Body and Human Soul of Christ differed in nothing but Holiness from those of ordinary Men—Body can suffer only to limited Extent—So of Human Soul—Sufferings of Christ Infinite, or, at least, beyond Mortal Endurance—Christ's Physical Capacities not expanded at last Passion—If so, he would not have Suffered in our Nature—Shifts to which Prevalent Theory is put to reconcile Extent of Christ's Sufferings with limited Capacities of Humanity to suffer.

HAVING thus completed our review of the dismay with which Christ beheld his coming sufferings, and the perturbation which their endurance caused him, we may confidently deduce from the premises the sure conclusion that his sufferings were infinite; or, if not infinite, that they inexpressibly surpassed any sufferings which mortal man ever bore, or which the highest angel in heaven, united to humanity, could have endured. We may now, therefore, return to the farther development of the principle which we laid down in a preceding page,\* that the body and human soul of Christ had not physical capabilities to become the recipient of the amount of sufferings demonstrated by his unparalleled dismay at their ap-

\* See page 193.

proach, and his extraordinary perturbation in their endurance.

As a preliminary to this branch of our argument, we would remind the reader that the body and human soul of Christ differed in nothing from the bodies and souls of ordinary men, except in being sinless. This important fact rests on the firm basis of the Bible. The leading feature in the revealed plan of redemption is, that the second person of the Trinity should suffer in our nature. He would not have suffered in our nature had his manhood, except in its sinless character, been either more or less than the nature of ordinary men. Had he suffered in an angelic nature, or in a superhuman nature, he would not have suffered in our nature; and thus the scriptural delineation of the atonement itself would have lost its characteristic feature.

The suggestion so often made and repeated by theorists, that the body and human soul of Christ had peculiar susceptibilities for suffering, finds no support in the oracles of God. The Bible informs us that "Jesus increased in wisdom and stature" like ordinary youths.—Luke, ii., 52. But on the great fact of the identity of his body and human soul, save in their exemption from sin, with the bodies and souls common to our race, the Bible

is still more explicit. The Holy Ghost, in language not to be frittered away by interpretation, has declared, "Wherefore in all things it behooved him to be made like unto his brethren."—Hebrews, ii., 17.

The identity between the manhood of Christ and our common nature being thus established, we may now avail ourselves of this interesting fact for the purpose of showing that his humanity had not physical capabilities to endure the weight of corporeal and spiritual sufferings manifestly devolved on him as the substitute for the sins of the world.

It is a principle of our nature, that the human body can, for the time, become the receptacle of only a given amount of suffering. Its capabilities of suffering are finite and limited. Those best schooled in the management of the rack, doubtless the most formidable instrument of cruelty, learned, from long experience, that there was a point at which even fiendish malice required them to stop in the infliction of pain. If, in their infatuated zeal, they were indiscreetly led beyond this point, their victim was sure to find respite in temporary insensibility. The laws of his physical nature would kindly step in to his relief. Hence the professors in the art of extorting human sighs and

human groans were taught to resort to the more tedious, but sure process of lingering torments. Thus they were enabled to effect, by the duration of the suffering, what they had failed to accomplish by its indiscreet intenseness.

So of mental suffering. The capacity of the human mind to suffer is, like its other faculties, limited. It is limited by those original and inflexible principles which form the constitution of the mind. If the cup of affliction is full, any new streams of bitterness will but make it overflow. When Rachel wept for her children, and refused to be comforted because they were not, the annihilation of half a continent, by some great convulsion of nature, would not have been likely, for the time, to augment her griefs. Mental suffering, like that of the body, may be indefinitely increased by its protraction, not by its intensity.

The question now directly arises whether, with powers limited to the ordinary standard of humanity, Christ's body and human soul had physical capacities to become the recipient of that unutterable weight of agony which it is manifest he endured. It is true that we cannot determine this question by the application of any rule deduced from the exact sciences. We have no balance for accurately weighing the powers of humanity



to suffer ; nor could we, if we dared, apply any process of human calculation to measure the precise length, and breadth, and height, and depth of the boundless sufferings of our Lord ; but appearances are sometimes as demonstrative as mathematics ; and when, with our vision expanded and sublimated by the stupendous scenes of Gethsemane and of Calvary, we direct it inward, to view, as through a microscope, the diminutive lineaments of our own material and immaterial natures, we are driven to the conclusion that the manhood of Christ ("made like unto his brethren") could not have been the recipient of all his illimitable sufferings with a force of demonstration almost as resistless as that which compels our assent to a proposition of Euclid.

All must concede the propriety of the conclusion just stated, if they believe that the sufferings of Christ were infinite. A finite being cannot be made the recipient of infinite anguish in a space less than eternity. The infinitude of the pains of the lost children of our race, in the abodes of despair, will be diluted by the current of ceaseless ages. Should omnipotence concentrate infinite suffering within the compass of even a few brief years, humanity could no more endure it than it could carry the world on its shoulders.

If the sufferings of Christ were less than infinite, did they not still exceed the limits of his humanity? In answering this question in the affirmative, we appeal to the scriptural intimations, scattered through the Old and New Testaments, evincing the extremity of our Saviour's sufferings; we appeal to the indications on the cross, and especially to those of the garden; we invoke the bloody sweat of Gethsemane, "falling down to the ground"—to be understood, not as a delusive metaphor, but as a stupendous truth; not as applicable to a person incapacitated by disease to retain in his veins and arteries the circulating and vital fluid, but as applicable to a person in perfect health.

Bring the case to the test of experiment. Fill a human soul brimful, to the utmost limit of its physical powers, with sufferings the most concentrated and intense that imagination can conceive, and it could never force through the pores of its clay tenement a bloody perspiration. For the truth of this, we appeal to universal history, profane and sacred. At Gethsemane, and there alone, has the anguish of the spirit ever made the sympathizing and healthful body sweat, as it were, great drops of blood. The occurrence of this awful exhibition there, and there only, proves of itself that the agonies of the garden were the throes and spasms of a nature lifted, in its suffering ca-

capacity, infinitely above the human soul of Christ. Go one step farther; make the body a fellow in suffering; after filling the human soul full of the keenest anguish to overflowing, load its clay sister also with the most exquisite pains, to the utmost limits of its physical powers; and the aggregate sufferings of the doubly-laden man will probably bear a less proportion to the awful totality of Christ's sufferings than the drop of the bucket bears to the "multitudinous sea." No imaginable concentration of human anguish, corporeal and mental, could ever have produced the appalling phenomenon which crimsoned the soil of Gethsemane.

We may, indeed, suppose that Omnipotence, at the time of the last passion, might have expanded the capacity of the manhood of Christ to suffer to an almost unlimited extent; but then he would not have suffered in our nature. Had the might of Gabriel been miraculously infused into the humanity of Christ, it would no longer have been our humanity. The created nature of Christ would have ceased to be human nature; it would have become a compound of the human and the angelic. The characteristic feature of the atonement of the Bible would thus have been marred. Christ would no longer have been "in all things like unto his brethren." Had Christ suffered in

this mingled nature, how could he have been what his apostle Peter represents him to have been when he says, "Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example?"—1 Peter, ii., 21. How could he have left us an example, with any expectation of our following it, unless he had actually suffered in our common nature? The supposition that he also suffered in his divine nature does not impair the efficacy of his human example. The supposition presents to us a suffering man to imitate; a suffering God to adore.

According to this aspect of the prevalent theory, Christ suffered in neither his divine nor human nature, but in a compound nature specially wrought out for the occasion, and nowhere intimated in the Bible. An angel appeared in the Garden of Gethsemane. But angel visits, while they impart consolation and strengthen faith, do not change the nature of the being visited. The faithful Abraham and the wrestling Jacob remained unaltered at the departure of their celestial visitant, except in increase of holiness. We do not infer that the "strengthening" envoy of the garden added anything to the physical capabilities of the sufferer for the endurance of pain. To impart to an ordinary man the strength of Samson, by miraculous interposition, to prepare him for some great bodily feat, would be to effect a change of his corporeal

nature. To have imparted to the human soul of Christ, by miraculous interposition, the strength and fortitude of an archangel, to prepare him for the endurance of his last passion, would have been to effect a change in the elements of the incorporeal portion of his humanity. He would then rather have taken on him "the nature of angels," than have remained of the unmixed "seed of Abraham."—Hebrews, ii., 16.

To reconcile the magnitude of Christ's sufferings with the limited capabilities of humanity to suffer, has ever been one of the most trying shifts of the prevalent theory. One class of its advocates, as has already appeared, have imagined that the manhood of Christ was mysteriously endowed with superhuman susceptibilities and powers of sufferance; but this airy phantom has not a scriptural intimation on which to perch itself. Another class of its adherents have sought to solve the phenomenon by depreciating the magnitude of the mediatorial sufferings. Whitby, the commentator, with a reckless hand, has undertaken to cut the Gordian knot, which he could not untie, by sinking to corporeal pains the expiatory agonies of the Son of God. Even the learned, eloquent, and devout Dwight felt himself constrained to say that "the degree of suffering which Christ underwent in making the atonement was far in-

ferior to that which will be experienced by an individual sufferer beyond the grave." So the Herculean intellect of the profound author of the "Freedom of the Will" was obliged to seek refuge in the same hypothesis.\*

Such depreciation of the price of redemption is without scriptural authority. The Bible nowhere intimates such a paucity of mediatorial sufferings; nor can reason evince the sufficiency of such limited sufferings to redeem a world by any process of human arithmetic. The debts of the redeemed to the exchequer of heaven were infinite, or, rather, they consisted of a countless number of infinitudes; for each of the redeemed owed, for his single self, an infinite debt. Christ became the substituted, the sole paymaster. The exchequer of heaven could receive nothing less than full payment, to the uttermost farthing. Any composition, or compromise, or partial satisfaction would have been more derogatory to infinite justice than a free forgiveness of the debts by one spontaneous act of flexible, yielding grace. Christ paid the debts of the redeemed in full. He paid in kind; in the same coin in which the redeemed must have paid. He substituted for their sufferings his own.

\* Whitby's Comments on Matthew, xxvi., 38; Dwight's Theology, vol. ii., p. 217; Edward's Works, vol. viii., p. 176, 177. New-York, 1830.

Christ, then, must have suffered as much as all the redeemed, but for him, would have suffered collectively, pang for pang, spasm for spasm, sigh for sigh, groan for groan ; he must have suffered, not only infinitely, but the infinitude of his suffering must have been multiplied by the number of the countless redeemed ; *unless* such deficiency as existed in the quantity of his suffering, compared with what would have been the aggregate sufferings of the redeemed, was made up by the transcendent superiority of its quality.

If we were permitted to believe that the divinity of Christ actually participated in his sufferings, then, indeed, the difficulty connected with their numerical quantity might be mitigated, and perhaps removed. The participation of his divinity in his sufferings might possibly have supplied their deficiency in quantity, compared with what the redeemed must have endured, by imparting to them an infinitely enhanced value. But the advocates of the prevalent theory, through all their classes, utterly deny that the divinity of Christ actually participated in his expiatory sufferings. To exclude the belief that his divinity actually suffered has been their object for fifteen centuries. To this object they have clung with a tenacity which time has not been able to loosen.



Yet does the prevalent theory require, for its vital principle, that there should have been an infusion of the Godhead into the mediatorial sufferings. This infusion we give in the awful fact that the divinity of Christ actually participated in all he underwent. The prevalent theory seeks to impart the divine infusion by supposing that the redeeming man suffered actually, and the redeeming God constructively. A preliminary objection to this supposition is, that it lacks scriptural support. The Bible, from its first verse to its last, gives no such intimation. It rests on human authority alone. The persons of the glorious Trinity are not wont to act constructively. Whatever they do, they do actually. It was not constructively that the Son of God created the worlds. It is not constructively that he will, one day, judge the quick and the dead. His heaven and his hell are not constructive. Nor was it merely constructively that his ethereal essence tasted "of death for every man."

The prevalent theory has a navigation embarrassed with more real obstacles than those imagined to inhibit the passage of the Sicilian strait when haunted by the fabled terrors of early mythology. When it raises to their proper altitude its conceptions of the infinite magnitude of the mediatorial agonies, it encounters the insuperable

difficulties arising from the limited capacities of humanity to suffer. If it lowers its views to the standard of humanity's limited powers, its meager estimate of the atoning sufferings affords but scanty aliment for the redemption of a world. The theory has its Scylla on the one side, and its Charybdis on the other. Nothing but the unequalled, though noiseless skill of its navigators has hitherto saved it from shipwreck.

Whichever way we wander, we are thus drawn back to the great central truth that the second person of the Trinity, clothed in manhood, suffered and died, as well in his ethereal essence as in his human nature, for the salvation of man. This august truth cannot, indeed, fully unravel the "mystery of godliness." That still remains, as it was beheld by the apostle and the angels, shrouded in its own ineffable majesty, "high and lifted up" above the ken of mortal scrutiny; but it clears the spiritual horizon of the vapours and clouds which human theories have congregated there. If it were believed that a God, made sin for sinners, was just about to meet the "fierceness and wrath" of an avenging God, the scene at Gethsemane, though towering to the third heaven in interest and grandeur, would lose some of its marvels. The bloody perspiration forcing itself through the corporeal substance of the incarnate,

self-devoted Deity; the shaking, almost to annihilation, of "the temple of his body;" the momentary, eager, soul-touching supplication that, if possible, the cup might pass from him; the appearance of the "strengthening" envoy from the celestial court, are what even the finite imagination might shadow forth as the appropriate preludes of an exhibition, from which the dismayed sun fled away.

The explanation unfolded by this august central truth, though it may not, durst not, cannot draw fully aside the veil of the inner sanctuary, where "the chastisement of our peace was upon Him" who created the worlds, yet indicates to our adoring vision the viewless, hidden cause, from whose mighty workings came that wondrous contrast between the penitent, joyous, exulting malefactor, and the suffering, writhing, sinking Deity by his side; extorting from his bursting spirit the piercing cry sent up to the Ancient of Days, "My God! my God! why hast thou forsaken me?"

If the redeeming God suffered in his divine essence, he must have suffered to a degree surpassing the apprehension of mortal man; probably surpassing the comprehension of the brightest archangel. He would not have healed "slightly the hurt of the daughter of his people."—Jeremiah, vi.,

14. He would not, by the paucity of the expiatory sufferings, have sunk, in the estimation of created intelligences, the dignity of his own divine law. Such sufferings must have been felt by the redeeming God as only a God has capacity to feel. If they did not pierce the very core of his divine heart, they might have lacked full atoning merit. They might have detracted from the grandeur of the Godhead; they might not have surpassed in magnificence the glory of the created worlds; they might have failed to form the brightest crown of Him who "wears on his head many crowns." And if, indeed, the God thus suffered, we might have expected that the near approach of his infinite agonies would have caused anticipations new and "strange" in the flight of eternal ages. We need not be surprised that their actual occurrence rent asunder the solid rocks, and convulsed to its centre the firm-seated, yet shuddering earth.

The precise mode in which the uncreated Son suffered in his ethereal essence to atone for the sins of our world we know not, nor dare we irreverently inquire. The stupendous fact of his own vicarious suffering is, of itself, the all-sufficient rock of Christian hope and Christian confidence. Its mode, if communicable to mortal apprehension, infinite wisdom has not seen fit to reveal. Systems of theism, manufactured in the

laboratories of earth, ever abound in minute details, designed to lure the imagination and to gratify the longing inquisitiveness of our fallen race, to probe the secrets of the "world unknown." Such was the mythology of classic antiquity, with its poetic gods, its poetic heaven, and its poetic hell. Such is the Koran of Mohammed, with its voluptuous paradise.

Such is not the Bible of the true God. Its revelations, like the supplies of miraculous food to the wayfaring Israelites, are just sufficient for our spiritual wants. There is no lack, no redundancy. The Bible contains ample nutriment for the immortal soul; not a jot of aliment for idle curiosity. Any surplus of revealed communications might be but a receptacle for the worms of polemic speculation.—Exodus, xvi., 20. This exact economy of its revelations is a distinguishing characteristic of scripture, strongly indicative of its celestial parentage. The scripture is its own best witness. The stars of the firmament and the Bible of our closets bear upon their faces the like inherent demonstration that their architect is divine.

## CHAPTER XVI.

Christ's Anticipations of last Passion previous to Night of Gethsemane—Luke, xii., 49–51: “I have a baptism to be baptized with—John, xii., 27, 28: “Now is my soul troubled”—John, xiii., 21: “He was troubled in spirit”—Hebrews, v., 7, 8: “When he had offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears”—Objection answered arising from Divine Prescience—Progress of Christ's Anticipations.

PREVIOUS to the night of Gethsemane, the apprehension of his approaching suffering had, more than once, visibly affected the incarnate God. The first passage illustrating this truth is the following: “I am come to send fire on the earth; and what will I, if it be already kindled?”—Luke, xii., 49. “But I have a baptism to be baptized with; and how am I straitened till it be accomplished!”—Luke, xii., 50. “Suppose ye that I am come to give peace on the earth? I tell you, Nay; but rather division.”—Luke, xii., 51. The whole passage has been transcribed, with a view the better to exhibit, in all its potency, the full meaning of the fiftieth verse. The speaker was Christ. The dreaded baptism was his last passion. Who was “straitened” until the baptism should be accomplished? Was it the man only? or was the indwelling God also “straitened?” Did the distressing apprehension pervade the

whole self of the divine speaker? or did it touch only his manhood, that finite speck, which bore a less proportion to the majestic whole than the glow-worm bears to the sun in the firmament?

In the forty-ninth and fifty-first verses his Godhead was clearly the paramount theme of the divine speaker. He adverted to his having "come" into the world; manifestly referring to his advent as the second person of the Trinity. He announced one of the effects of his having "come" into the world. His advent was to "send fire" and engender "division" on the earth. The foretold "shaking of the nations" was to be effected, not by the meek and pacific son of Mary, but by the almighty power of the indwelling God. The piercing "division" created by the Gospel pervaded and severed the sinews, and arteries, and very heart of the social world. A fire was kindled on the day of Pentecost, whose mighty conflagration scarcely ceased to rage until the faith of the fishermen had fixed its sandalled foot on the throne of the Cæsars. This triumph of the religion of the cross over the marshalled powers of unbelieving man, armed with the terrors of persecution, headed by the prince of darkness, and re-enforced by all his legions, was, perhaps, the most stupendous miracle ever displayed by him who came "to send fire on the earth."



If, then, in the forty-ninth and fifty-first verses of this memorable passage, the Godhead of the divine speaker was thus the almost exclusive theme, is it indeed true that, in the intervening, or fiftieth verse, it became, as it were, utterly merged in the little atom of his manhood ! Did the Godhead suddenly pass, in the continuous discourse, under a total eclipse at the end of the forty-ninth verse, which eclipse as suddenly disappeared at the beginning of the fifty-first ? Or, to drop the figures, did the incarnate God, at the commencement of the fiftieth verse, abruptly descend from his divinity to his mere manhood, and as abruptly reascend, at the end of that verse, from his mere manhood back to his divinity ?

Such a double transition, so instantaneously repeated, would have seemed almost a phenomenon, had we been forced to yield our credence to its existence, by intrinsic indications that such was the intention of the speaker ; but there are no such indications on the face or in the relations of the passage. The divine speaker passed through these contiguous and kindred verses, himself designated in each by the same personal pronoun "I," without the slightest intimation of any change in the natures of which he spoke. The subject represented by that personal pronoun formed, in each of the three verses, the one undivided and indi-

visible theme. If his Godhead was the chief agent in sending "fire" and engendering "division" on the earth, his Godhead was to be the chief recipient of the dreaded "baptism."

To impute to the speaking God a double change of subject, radical and vast as the change from the infinite to the finite, and thence back again from the finite to the infinite, affecting, too, his own united being, within the compass of this brief passage, without a shadow of change in the language which his wisdom chose, would seem, indeed, like the mere dream of fancy ; or, if we are obliged to view it as a daylight and waking theory, we cannot but regard it as one of the boldest efforts of that bold hypothesis, "God is impassible." Such a dream, or such a theory, if so we must call it, should find no registered place among the fundamental articles of Christian faith.

If, then, we may justly infer from the language of Christ, in the fiftieth verse of the passage under review, compared with his language in the german verses, which go before and after it, that he intended to comprehend in that verse, as well as in the other two, both of his united natures, we have the conclusive authority of the Son of God, that his divinity as well as his manhood was

“straitened” by the dread of the coming “baptism.”

The next passage showing that the dismay of the incarnate God, caused by his approaching sufferings, had anticipated the scene of the garden, is the following : “Now is my soul troubled ; and what shall I say ? Father, save me from this hour : but for this cause came I unto this hour.” —John, xii., 27. What soul was troubled ? The prevalent theory would say that it was the mere human soul of the divine victim. So said not the divine victim himself. His declaration, in its plain and obvious import, comprehended his whole united spirituality. The limiting adjective “human” fell not from the lips of the incarnate God. It is the interpolation of earth.

“Father, save me from this hour : but for this cause came I unto this hour.” The august Comer was the second person of the Trinity. Upon his advent he had received the “body” prepared for him, and thus “manifest in the flesh” had meekly awaited that hour of hours. But upon the near approach of that tremendous hour, new and “strange” in the annals of eternity, when God the Father was to pour on God the Son, made sin for sinners, the storm of infinite wrath, compounded of the “multitudinous” transgressions of all the re-

deemed, the self-devoted victim, almighty as he was, for a moment stood appalled. "Father, save me from this hour." The august Comer and the momentary Supplicant were one, designated by the little pronouns "I" and "me." Both pronouns referred to the self-same Being; both referred to the totality of that Being; both included within their illimitable import the whole incarnate Deity. The coming God, the "troubled" God, the supplicating God were identical. In each stage of the stupendous action the God was the chief Actor, the man but the humble adjunct.

Farther proof that, of Christ's painful anticipations, the garden was not the first witness, is to be found in the following passage: "When Jesus had thus said, he was troubled in spirit, and testified, and said, Verily, verily, I say unto you, that one of you shall betray me."—John, xiii., 21. This passage has its date just after our Lord's institution of the sacramental supper, and on the same night in which his prediction of the treason of one of his disciples was fulfilled. The Greek word here translated "spirit" is used in the Bible, as well as the dictionary, in opposition to matter. Its scriptural, as well as its lexicographic meaning, is "immaterial substance." It denotes animated immateriality, whether found in man, in angels, or in the Godhead. Take the following specimens of its

application to the divine essence. St. Peter said of Christ: "Being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit;" meaning, doubtless, by the quickening Spirit the Spirit of the Omnipotent.—1 Peter, iii., 18. The "Alpha and the Omega," who appeared to his beloved disciple in the first three chapters of Revelation, styled himself the "Spirit." "Hear what the Spirit saith unto the Churches."—Revelation, ii., 17. "God is a Spirit," declared the same inspired disciple.—John, iv., 24.

"He was troubled in spirit." The term "spirit" was clearly applicable, according to its scriptural meaning, to his ethereal essence; it was just as applicable to his ethereal essence as to his human intellect. Inspiration employed a term whose natural boundaries included both. To exclude his Godhead would be doing violence to those natural boundaries. It would be reducing them, by force and arms, from their inherent infinitude down to the finite compass of humanity. Inspiration interposed no discrimination between the human intellect and the ethereal essence of Christ. If we are permitted to understand the term as inspiration has elsewhere taught us to understand it, his whole immaterial being, in both its elements, "was troubled." We are ignorant of any principle of grammar or of logic by which human

reason can interpose any discriminating barrier. Yet has the theory of presuming man dared to lay down on the scriptural map a line of demarcation, impassable as the walls of heaven, where no line of demarcation has been marked by the Holy Ghost. It has dared to affirm that inspiration was so absorbed in the human as to lose sight of the divine Spirit of the incarnate God.

In this connexion, a passage from one of the epistles, manifestly referring to the agonies of Christ at Gethsemane, may advantageously be introduced: "Who in the days of his flesh, when he had offered up prayers and supplications, with strong crying and tears, unto Him that was able to save him from death, and was heard in that he feared; though he were a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered."—Hebrews, v., 7, 8. Who was the suppliant of this passage that "offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears?" It was certainly Christ. In what nature did he thus agonizingly supplicate? We suppose in both his natures; especially in his paramount, or divine nature.

The earnest suppliant was distinguished, in the passage, by two characteristic marks: he was "a Son," the eternal Son; and he thus strongly

supplicated "in the days of his flesh;" that is to say, in the days of his manhood on earth. The eternal Sonship of the supplicant was not predicable of the human progeny of Mary; nor were the expressions, "in the days of his flesh." The phrase, "in the days of his flesh," implies that there had been a time when the tearful supplicant had not been in the flesh; not clothed in human nature; when he had existed in another mode or state of being.

But the manhood of Christ had never been out of the flesh. It was created in the flesh; it was in the flesh in the manger; it was in the flesh on the cross; it was in the flesh, awaiting its quick-returning spirit, in the tomb of Joseph; it is in the flesh on the right hand of God. It was only to the divinity of Christ that the inspired writer to the Hebrews could have applied the descriptive peculiarity, "in the days of his flesh." That was, indeed, a memorable era in the eternity of the second person of the Trinity. He had been a disembodied and glorious spirit from everlasting. He first came into the flesh when he made himself incarnate. The days of the God Christ Jesus on earth were emphatically and descriptively "the days of his flesh." But the phrase would have been unmeaning if applied to the man Christ Jesus. It would have marked no era in his existence.



We have it, then, established by two distinguishing and unerring badges, that the Suppliant in the passage from Hebrews was not simply the human offspring of the Virgin. His "prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears" were not the mere ebullitions of human frailty. The Suppliant was the eternal Son of God. To him pertained a state of antecedent existence, not comprehended "in the days of his flesh." The Suppliant, then, was the second, the incarnate person of the Trinity. The imploring voice; the strong crying; the tears; the spirit which prompted that crying and those tears, were his. He who "feared" was he who had made the worlds. In this fearing, deprecatory scene of the mediatorial drama the divinity predominated as much as it did in the stupendous scene where the "five barley loaves and two small fishes" were made the superabundant aliment of five thousand famished persons.

But was it, indeed, the second person of the Trinity who "offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears," and "was heard in that he feared?" Let Gethsemane answer the inquiry. Let the garden, where, "being in an agony, he prayed more earnestly, and his sweat was, as it were, great drops of blood falling down to the ground," reveal the awful truth. Let

the angel respond who appeared unto him "from heaven, strengthening" the "fearing," the almost sinking God.

We have heard it orally objected that if, at the approach of Christ's passion, the dismay caused by its anticipation affected his divine nature, the same anticipation must equally have affected his divinity before it became incarnate; that to the divine mind the past and the future are one concentrated now; that to Him who fills eternity the anticipation of the cross was just as vivid before the creation of the worlds as it was in the garden; that our doctrine, therefore, would convert the illimitable pre-existence of the Son of God into one saddened, unbroken Gethsemane.

To this objection we have a ready response. If we have failed to show, by scriptural evidence, that the divinity of Christ shared in the dismay caused by his approaching suffering, then this particular branch of our argument fails of itself. It needs not to be assailed by extraneous objection; it sinks under the burden of its own weight; its foundation is ascertained to be laid in unstable sand. But if we have succeeded in showing, by scriptural proofs, that the divinity of Christ participated in the dismay caused by his coming passion, then is our position fixed upon a rock. Un-

derneath it is the everlasting foundation of the Bible. And because human reason, dimly peering through its earthy telescope, cannot scan the vast dimensions of that infinite Essence "manifest in the flesh," so as to ascertain with precision how his divine nature could, in harmony with all his attributes, have partaken of the dismay caused by the anticipated outpouring of his Father's wrath, shall human reason, thus thwarted by the diminutiveness of its own powers of vision, venture boldly to repudiate a doctrine proved to be scriptural, and so deeply interesting to Christian faith?

Other answers to the objection may be given. The supposition that the past eternity and the future eternity are, to the divine mind, one concentrated now, rests not on scriptural authority. It is based on metaphysical speculation. Human reason has no right to speculate concerning the unrevealed mysteries of God; to convert his eternity into one monotonous now; to deprive him of the joys of retrospect, and the delights of anticipation. The past and the future are essentially different from the present, in the nature of things. The Omnipotent could not, by the word of his power, make them identical, without violating the inflexible laws of his empire, any more than he could make two and two amount to five. That past things and future things should be present

things is a physical contradiction. The Son of God is not now creating the worlds; he is not now suspended on the cross; he is not now judging the quick and the dead. To view those widely separated events as contemporaneous, would be to view them falsely.

The God of truth sees things as they are. He views the past as gone, the future as to come, the present alone as actually present. To his mind the deluge is not now riding in triumph over the tops of the mountains; to his mind the elements are not now melting with fervent heat. Progression is a fundamental principle of God's empire, and progressive events are viewed as progressive by the infinitely wise Legislator. The reckless violation of all laws by the afterward penitent malefactor, his belief with the heart when apostles fled, and his repose in paradise on the bosom of his redeeming God, were not simultaneous events in the estimation of the dwellers upon the earth, or in the view of Him who "inhabiteth eternity."

The memory of the Deity, doubtless, reaches back to the earliest past; his prescience reaches forward to the latest future. Eternity and immensity have no recesses hidden from omniscience. How vivid may be his anticipations of coming events, brought home by his unerring prescience,

the Bible has not told us with perfect distinctness. On this sacred theme we may, perhaps, without irreverence, draw some twilight imaginings from the analogy of his earthly substitute, made in his own image, and after his own likeness, and into whose nostrils he breathed "the breath of life." To a good man it may be revealed, as it was to Peter, that a violent death awaits him. The conviction of his bitter doom is sure; the cruel death dwells ever in his conscious breast. Yet does not its sting disturb his happiness or serenity, until the hour draws nigh for the triumph of the king of terrors.

So the Bible shadows forth the progressive intenseness of the anticipations of the Son of God, caused by his approaching suffering. When he foretold his passion first, it produced in him little seeming emotion. "From that time forth began Jesus to show unto his disciples how he must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things."—Matthew, xvi., 21. "And he began to teach them that the Son of man must suffer many things."—Mark, viii., 31. A little farther onward, in Luke, he declared, "But I have a baptism to be baptized with, and how am I straitened till it be accomplished." Still onward, in John, he exclaimed, "Now is my soul troubled; and what shall I say? Father, save me from this hour: but for this cause

came I unto this hour." And at Gethsemane, when the dreaded "baptism," the tremendous "hour" was just at hand, "being in an agony," he sweat "as it were great drops of blood, falling down to the ground."

## X

## CHAPTER XVII.

Proofs of Divinity of Christ's Sufferings derived from Old Testament—Fifty-third Chapter of Isaiah—Isaiah, lxiii. : "I have trodden the wine-press alone"—Zechariah, xiii., 7 : "Awake, O sword, against my Shepherd"—Zechariah, xii., 10 : "And they shall look upon Me, whom they have pierced."

IN the progress of our argument, we have hitherto confined ourselves to evidence deduced from the New Testament. But the Old Testament is not to be overlooked or undervalued. Though its inspired patriarchs and prophets saw as "through a glass darkly," yet does the wonderful fulfilment of their inspired visions afford one of the most striking proofs of the verity of our holy religion. The Old Testament shadows forth the Messiah to come in colours not to be mistaken. It plainly intimates his miraculous conception; it places the glorious truth of his divinity beyond peradventure; it announces him as a sufferer for the sins of others in terms peculiar and significant; and, when it thus alludes to him as a sufferer, it limits not his sufferings to a single department of his being; it speaks of him, not as a partial, but as a general sufferer. The prevalent theory of later times, that the sufferings of Christ were confined to his humanity, finds no countenance in the Old Testa-



ment. The Old Testament leaves us to believe that the expected Messiah would suffer in the same undivided and indivisible natures in which he was to be born.

The last three verses of the fifty-second chapter of Isaiah, and the whole of the fifty-third chapter of that sublimest of the sons of men, have Christ for their absorbing theme. Their reference to the Messiah who was to come is so palpable that, in reading the passages, we may consider the name of Christ as actually substituted for the nameless sufferer, whose heart-touching story is there told with a pathos not to be found in the "multitudinous" volumes of uninspired lore. With a pen dipped in his tears, the rapt prophet recounted the imputed imperfections and outward pangs of his beloved Saviour; his marred visage; his want of form and comeliness to the carnal eye; his wounds for our transgressions; his bruises for our iniquities; his stripes by which we are healed. But when he drew near to the furnace of expiatory suffering burning within, pervading the spiritual elements of the incarnate God in the most inaccessible recesses of his sacred being, the prophet's powers of expression, copious as they were, seemed utterly inadequate to the overpowering thoughts that were hovering around him. He could but say, "His soul" shall be made "an offering for

sin ;” “ he shall pour out his soul unto death ;” “ he shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied.”—Isaiah, liii., 10–12.

The Hebrew word here translated “ soul” is of most capacious import. It signifies breathing, living immateriality, wherever found. In the first chapter of his inspired history, Moses applied this Hebrew term to designate the vital principle of the lower ranks of animated nature, though our translators have there rendered it “ creature.”—Genesis, i., 24. The royal psalmist used this identical Hebrew word to denote the ethereal essence of the Deity. “ The Lord trieth the righteous : but the wicked and him that loveth violence his soul hateth.”—Psalm xi., 5. The same Hebrew word was used for the same purpose in Judges. “ And they put away the strange gods from among them, and served the Lord : and his soul was grieved for the misery of Israel.”—Judges, x., 16. The same Hebrew word was also twice used in Jeremiah to express the ethereal essence of God. “ Shall I not visit for these things ? saith the Lord ; and shall not my soul be avenged on such a nation as this ?”—Jeremiah, v., 9. “ Yea, I” (the Lord) “ will rejoice over them to do them good, and I will plant them in this land assuredly with my whole heart and with my whole soul.”—Jeremiah, xxxii., 41.

When Isaiah appropriated the same Hebrew term to the expected Messiah; the predicted Immanuel; the "child" that should be born; the "son" that should be given; whose name should be called "Wonderful, Counsellor, the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace," he must have meant to use the term in as comprehensive a sense as it was used by his brother-prophets. He must have intended to designate the whole breathing, animated, living immateriality of the God "manifest in the flesh," whose advent had, from the creation, formed the glowing theme of inspired prediction and heaven-taught song. The Hebrew word is used by the evangelical prophet without stint or limitation. The human soul of the anticipated Messiah, the "Wonderful, Counsellor, the mighty God, the everlasting Father," was so small a speck in the distant and boundless horizon of his united and infinite spirituality as scarcely to engage, much less to absorb the expanded vision of the rapt seer.

The Prophet Isaiah must, then, be understood as saying, that the whole immaterial nature of Christ should be made an offering for sin; that his whole immaterial nature should be poured out unto death; that he should see of the travail of his whole immaterial nature and be satisfied. If any biblical critic should wish to limit the Hebrew

word translated "soul" to the mere human soul of Christ, let him test the accuracy of his criticism by actually inserting before the substantive "soul," as often as it is here repeated, the adjective "human." We do not perceive how the critic can object to this test ; for, if the adjective is to be silently incorporated by intendment, it might as well be actually incorporated by an overt act. We have already alluded to this test as applicable to passages in the New Testament ; but its importance seems to justify its repetition here.

The prophecy of Isaiah contains other passages bearing on our subject. We select one of them : "I have trodden the wine-press alone."—Isaiah, lxiii., 3. What was the wine-press thus trodden ? It was not the wine-press of some terrestrial vintage. It was, what it is elsewhere called in scripture, "the wine-press of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God."—Revelation, xix., 15. Who was he who trod this wine-press alone ? It was he "that cometh from Edom, with dyed garments from Bozrah ;" "travelling in the greatness of his strength."

"I have trodden the wine-press alone" was a declaration of too lofty and awful an import to have been designed by the Holy Ghost for the "meek and lowly" human son of the Virgin. The

solitary Treader of "the wine-press of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God" was the second person of the Trinity, arrayed, indeed, in the habiliments of manhood. None but a God could have trodden the terrible wine-press of the wrath of God. The human son of Mary had not physical capabilities to tread this wine-press alone; and had his humanity been expanded for the awful event by the omnipotence of its indwelling God, it would thenceforth have ceased to be the humanity of our common race.

The Treader of the wine-press had trodden it alone. If the man had been its treader, strengthened by the divinity within, solitariness could not have been predicated of him. He is not alone who knows himself to be attended and supported by an indwelling Deity. Gabriel is not alone, though, apart from his fellow-angels, he may stand in more close attendance on the inaccessible majesty of the Highest. The three holy men, "upon whose bodies the fire had no power," were not alone in the Babylonian furnace. There was a fourth present; "and the form of the fourth" was "like the Son of God." He walked with them through the flames, and saved them untouched by the conflagration. Well was it said of them that they were not alone.—Daniel, iii., 25, 27. He who trod the wine-press alone, clothed in his gar-

ment of flesh, was none other than he who, in the beginning, raised his solitary trumpet note, and behold, the dark profound straightway beamed with joyous light.

We are not ignorant that the Treader of the wine-press is generally supposed, by the advocates of the prevalent theory, to have been, not the suffering Christ, but Christ the avenger. We have the misfortune to differ from them in this, as in other conclusions. We may here be wrong. If so, the reader has only to subtract from the sum-total of our scriptural proofs this single item. We are confident that the aggregate of our proofs drawn from Holy Writ may well sustain this insulated subtraction.

The following passage carries on its face its own demonstration : "Awake, O sword, against my shepherd, and against the man that is my fellow, saith the Lord of Hosts : smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered."—Zechariah, xiii., 7. In this sublime and wonderful passage, the speaker is the infinite Father. The Son had been speaking in the preceding chapter under the name of the "Lord ;" but in this passage the Father appeared as the speaker, by the appellation of the "Lord of Hosts." What was the subject to be smitten ? To show that it was to be the Christ,

we need scarcely refer to Matthew, xxvi., 31 ; Mark, xiv., 27. The face of the passage itself demonstrates, not only that the Father was the speaker, but also that the subject to be smitten was the incarnate Son. In what nature was the incarnate Son to be smitten ? Was it in his two united natures, or in one of them only, leaving the other altogether scathless ? Our opponents allege that the subject to be smitten was the mere humanity of the Son incarnate. This they are obliged to allege ; for if the smiting was but to touch the divine nature of the incarnate God, their theory must utterly fail.

We suppose that the humanity of the incarnate Son was not to be the sole subject of the smiting. The mere humanity of the child of the Virgin was not the fellow of the Highest. The fellow of the everlasting Father, like his infinite self, must have been one who “inhabiteth eternity”—the eternity of the past as well as the eternity of the future. Of all the wonders of the vast creation, visible or invisible, not the least is the wonder, often pressed on our contemplations, of the exact economy of the Almighty Creator, in his use of means to accomplish his wise and gracious ends. The energies invoked, like the manna of the Desert, are always just sufficient ; there is nothing wanting, nothing to spare. The wastefulness of



human prodigality can find no precedent or countenance in the example of the Highest. And did he, so wisely provident of the resources even of his own exhaustless and infinite treasury, indeed awakened from its repose his own almighty sword—the highest resort of avenging omnipotence—only to smite the frail humanity of the man of Nazareth? Had the smiting of his mere humanity been the sole object of the Lord of Hosts, its sure execution might have been left to the irons of the cross, or to the soldier's spear, if the irons proved too dilatory in their work. There would have been no seeming need for invoking the sword of the Lord of Hosts.

Another term of designation in the passage is demonstrative that the subject of the smiting was not the humanity of Christ alone. "Awake, O sword, against my shepherd." And again, the divine speaker said, "Smite the shepherd." Who was the Shepherd of the Lord of Hosts? Even he who was his fellow.—Psalm xxiii., i. Isaiah, xl., 11. John, x., 14. Hebrews, xiii., 20. 1 Peter, ii., 25; v., 4. This was the Shepherd who meekly descended to earth, to redeem with his blood, and gather in from every nation and every clime, his Father's dispersed and lost flock. The humanity of Bethlehem's babe was not the Shepherd of the Lord of Hosts; it was but the adjunct

of that Shepherd; the vestment in which that Shepherd arrayed himself; the tabernacle of flesh in which that Shepherd dwelt.

That same Shepherd of the infinite Father is yet his Shepherd. In the green pastures of paradise he still feeds his Father's flock; still he folds the lambs in his bosom. There, clothed in his now glorified vestment of humanity, he will continue the Shepherd of the Most High as long as the golden walls of the great sheep-fold of heaven shall rest secure on their everlasting foundations. This was the Shepherd against whose divine, as well as human nature, the Lord of Hosts invoked his almighty sword. Spare the God, but smite the man, was not his high command. His omnipotent mandate went forth without exception or restriction; general, universal; pervading every element, searching out every recess of the united natures; brief, simple, majestic; yet more lucid than the sunbeam. "Smite the Shepherd."

The passage contains other proofs that it was against both of the united natures of Christ that the sword of the Lord of Hosts was summoned to awake. The ethereal essence of the second person of the Trinity formed the divine nature of the incarnate Son; the body and soul of an ordinary man, cleansed from the stain of sin, formed

his human nature. The union of these two natures is often styled, in Christian phraseology, the God-man. It may be denominated, with, perhaps, equal force and propriety, the man-God. In arranging the two elements of the complex name, we may as well ascend from the human nature to the divine as to descend from the divine nature to the human. It is in the ascending grade that the infinite Father himself ranked the two natures. He invoked his awakening sword, not only against "my Shepherd," but also "against the man that is my fellow ;" that is to say, against the man-God.

Two ingredients entered into the composition of the subject that was to be smitten: humanity and fellowship with the Highest. The word "fellow," as here used, is synonymous with equal. The appellation was inapplicable to the humanity of the incarnate Son. But there was veiled within that humanity the ethereal essence of the second person of the Trinity, who was, indeed, the fellow of the everlasting Father; who had occupied the right-hand seat of the Father's throne for countless ages ere time was known in the universe. That the humanity of Christ was not the fellow of the Highest, is proved by the declaration fresh from the lips of the incarnate God, when speaking of the inferiority of his human nature: "For my Father is greater than I."—John, xiv., 28.

Those who confine to the mere humanity of the incarnate Son the mandate of the Lord of Hosts to his omnipotent sword, unwittingly subtract from his words their vital aliment. If the mandate is not allowed to comprehend the fellow of the Highest in his united natures, the life of the words is extinguished forever. The terms, "the man that is my fellow," have the same amplitude of meaning as the term "shepherd," twice repeated in the passage.

There are yet other expressions, hitherto unnoticed, in this astounding passage, indicating that it was something infinitely beyond the mortal death of him of Nazareth which called forth the sword of the Lord of Hosts from its scabbard. It was summoned to awake; which implies that it had previously been in a state of repose—a repose, perhaps, until then unbroken in the flight of eternal ages. It was summoned not only to awake, but to awake and "smite;" to awake, therefore, in the majesty of its might, in the terrors of its wrath. It was to "do his work, his strange work; and bring to pass his act, his strange act"—Isaiah, xxviii., 21—that the infinite Father invoked his slumbering sword. A God was to be smitten by a God! The infinite Father was to smite his other self; his own beloved, only-begotten Son; his meek and unresisting Shepherd; the fellow of his

everlasting reign! No wonder that the sword of the Lord of Hosts—the keenest weapon in the armory of the Godhead—was summoned to awake from its long repose. Nothing but the sword of a God should, could have smitten a God.

In this awful passage we seem to hear the audible voice of the Eternal, as it was once heard from Sinai, announcing prophetically the tremendous truth, since reiterated by the Holy Ghost, God “spared not his own Son.” How feeble and evanescent was the purposed sacrifice by the faithful Abraham, even to typify the finished, the efficient, the universe-pervading sacrifice by the infinite Father. We say universe-pervading, and, we trust, without irreverence; for who can doubt that the whole vast empire of the Godhead was benignly affected, to an extent nameless, illimitable, inconceivable, in its peace, in its prosperity, in the enduring happiness of its countless worlds, by the one great sacrifice on Calvary, seen and viewless.

There is a preceding passage in the same prophet, which demands our attention: “And I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of supplications; and they shall look upon me whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for him, as one that

mourneth for his only son, and shall be in bitterness for him, as one that is in bitterness for his first-born.”—Zechariah, xii., 10. This prophecy was uttered by the second person of the Trinity. The infinite Father became the speaker in the next chapter. In this chapter the speaker was the infinite Son. The subject to be pierced was the God “manifest in the flesh.”—John, xix., 37.

The corporeal piercing was not merely the perforation of the sufferer’s inanimate side by the Roman spear; his living hands and feet were to be pierced. “They shall pierce my hands and my feet.”—Psalm xxii., 16. “Corporal sufferance” was not, however, the sole price to be paid for the salvation of man. The “iron entered the soul” of the vicarious victim. This is generally allowed, even by the advocates of the prevalent theory. The majority believe that the soul of the sufferer was pierced; but their faith stops at the dividing line between his human and divine spirit. Why stop at that line? No such stopping-place is indicated on the scriptural chart.

The God was also to be pierced. The speaking God of the prophet was to be the pierced God of the evangelist. The awakened sword of the Lord of Hosts was to penetrate the most sacred recesses of his divine essence. The speaking God of the prophet was the mighty “*me*” of the pre-

diction. "They shall look upon me whom they have pierced." And now mark well the sudden and significant change of phraseology: "And they shall mourn for *him*." Why this sudden transmutation of the third for the first person? It was no idle play of words; the transition was big with meaning. The speaker was God the Son. He designated by the pronoun "me" his own ethereal essence. But at the time of the fulfilment of the prophecy, a new nature was to be added, consisting of a perfect man, corporeally and intellectually. To that adjunct nature—the man to be united to the God—the pronoun "him" was applied: "They shall look upon me whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for him." The viewless sword of the Lord of Hosts was to pervade both natures of the incarnate Deity.

The human piercers, when "the spirit of grace and of supplications" should be poured into their hearts, would look upon the pierced God, and wonder, and repent, and adore; they would mourn for the pierced man with the same deep and affectionate mortal grief with which one "mourneth for his only son," and "be in bitterness for him as one is in bitterness for his first-born." The human piercers, fiendish as was their intent, were but the instruments of infinite retribution. The efficient Piercer of the divine substitute for sinners was the Lord of Hosts.



## CHAPTER XVIII.

Scriptural Passages ascribing Blessedness to the Deity—If they are more than Doxologies, they imply no Incapacity to sustain Voluntary Suffering—Divine Beatitude progressive—"Joy set before"—"the Author and Finisher of our Faith"—Divine Immutability—Not impugned by our Argument.

THE scriptural passages ascribing blessedness to the Deity will, doubtless, be invoked in favour of his impassibility. The following are samples of these passages: "Blessed be the most high God."—Genesis, xiv., 20. "Blessed be the Lord God of Israel forever and ever."—1 Chronicles, xvi., 36. "Blessed be the Lord God of Israel from everlasting to everlasting."—Psalm xli., 13. "Blessed be the Lord forever more."—Psalm lxxxix., 52. 'Blessed be the King of Israel, that cometh in the name of the Lord.'—John, xii., 13. "And worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed forever."—Romans, i., 25. "Of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is over all, God blessed forever."—Romans, ix., 5. "Until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ; which in his times he shall show, who is the blessed and only Potentate."—1 Timothy, vi., 15.

We believe these passages to be rather doxologies than declarations of doctrine ; rather ascriptions of praise and thanksgiving to the Deity than averments of his infinite beatitude. So thought MacKnight, the learned annotator on the apostolic epistles. The passage which seems to approach nearer than, perhaps, any other in the whole Bible, to a declaration of the unchanging felicity of the Godhead from everlasting to everlasting, is that which we have just transcribed from the first chapter of Romans, where it is said that the heathen “ worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed forever.” The learned annotator on the epistles, in his commentary on this passage, though himself a firm adherent of the prevalent theory, rendered the passage thus : “ Worshipped and served the creature rather than the Creator, who is to be *praised* forever.”\* But if any of the passages are to be regarded as declarations of the divine blessedness, they contain no affirmation or intimation that the beatitude of the Deity is fixed by a law paramount to his own volition, so that neither of the persons of the Trinity has capacity to become a voluntary sufferer.

The ascriptions of blessedness in scripture were often applied to Christ. It was of Christ that the apostle declared, “ Who is over all, God blessed

\* MacKnight on the Epistles, vol. i., p. 149.

forever." It was of Jesus Christ that he again declared, "Who is the blessed and only Potentate." These ascriptions were applicable as well to his manhood as to his Godhead. They reached and pervaded both of his united natures. The united being, the whole Christ of the Bible, was styled "the blessed and only Potentate." The whole Christ was denominated, "God blessed forever." And yet this same united Being had just passed through the most terrible furnace of suffering ever lighted up on earth. If the ascriptions implied declarations of unchanged beatitude, and reached the past as well as the coming eternity, then Christ suffered not. His passion was but Oriental imagery. It was Christ, termed in the passage from the twelfth chapter of John "the King of Israel," on whom the epithet "blessed" was bestowed as he was entering Jerusalem to be crucified. If the passage was intended, not as a mere hosanna, but a declaration of Christ's beatitude, it must have meant a beatitude of which he was capable of "emptying himself," when required by the good of the universe and the glory of the Godhead; for in a few hours afterward he voluntarily paid, by his own unimaginable sufferings, the price of a world's redemption.

No direct affirmations of scripture were necessary to demonstrate the beatitude of God. It re-

sults from the infinitude of his perfections. A Being of infinite power, knowledge, wisdom, holiness, justice, and goodness, has within himself infinite resources of felicity. But the felicity of the Deity is subject to his volition. He is not fated to the same unchangeable condition of blessedness whether he wills it or not. His beatitude is, like his glory, rather the emanation of his combined attributes than a distinct attribute of itself. Of his beatitude, as well as of his glory, the uncreated Son was capable of divesting himself for a time when he became a terrestrial sojourner in the flesh. His infinite power, and knowledge, and wisdom, and holiness, and justice, and goodness remained unchanged. But his glory and his beatitude he voluntarily cast aside for a brief season, that he might resume them again in increased and everlasting effulgence and perfection.

Had the second person of the Trinity peremptorily declined to suffer when his suffering was prompted by the affections of his own benignant heart, sanctioned by his own unerring wisdom, and approved in the council of the Godhead, none on earth can be sure that his bliss might not have sustained a greater diminution from the absence than it has from the endurance of suffering thus prompted, sanctioned, and approved. The aggregate of earthly happiness is measured by the span

of human life ; the aggregate of divine felicity is weighed in the balances of eternity. None on earth can say that the brief suffering of the second person of the Trinity in the flesh has not augmented the totality of his beatitude, when tested by the arithmetic of heaven. Had he reposed unmoved on his throne, and beheld, afar off, the smoke of the torment of the apostate pair, and of the countless generations of their descendants, ascending up forever and ever, how can human reason venture to decide that, in the flight of endless ages, the eternity of his bliss might not have suffered more than it will have suffered from his mournful, but short earthly pilgrimage ?

Reasoning pride has no grounds for concluding that the compassionate heart of our divine Redeemer might not have yearned unceasingly over the undistinguished perdition of a whole race, created by his own hands, in his own similitude, and seduced from unsuspecting innocence by the matchless wiles of one who had before beguiled from allegiance the third part of heaven. The ascending smoke would have been at once the memorial of a world destroyed, and the waving banner of his triumphant foe. Now has his divine and expiatory suffering bound that foe in everlasting chains, and proffered to every son and daughter of that world destroyed the healing and

saving blood of his own most precious salvation. Now will the benignancy of infinite love forever overflow, and the pillars of infinite justice stand firm and sure as the foundations of the universe.

We believe that the beatitude of the Deity is progressive. Progression seems to be a governing principle, pervading the intellectual universe. Its display in man is palpable. Doubtless it pervades the angelic hosts. Why should it not reach the beatitude even of him who made progressive man in "his own image," and after "his own likeness?" We learn that the bliss of heaven is enhanced by the repentance of a single sinner on earth. Who will venture to presume that this enhancement of blessedness ascends not even to those who fill the celestial throne? That the glory of God is progressive, is a clear deduction from his own holy word. His beatitude is a sister emanation from the Godhead. Why, then, if one of the sacred sisters is found to be progressive, should the other be supposed to be stationary?

We believe it deducible from scripture, not only that the divine blessedness is progressive, but also that the beatitude of the uncreated Son will, in the reckoning of eternity, be immeasurably enhanced by his mediatorial sufferings and triumph. "Looking unto Jesus, the author and finisher of our faith,

who, for the joy that was set before him, endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God.”—Hebrews, xii., 2. This passage was, doubtless, applied to the redeeming man. We believe it to have been still more emphatically applied to the redeeming God. It was predicated of Jesus, that august Being who, in himself, united a terrestrial atom to celestial infinity. It was predicated of him without limitation or exception. Its terms comprehended his divine as well as his human nature.

The subject of the passage is farther distinguished as “the Author and Finisher of our faith.” The human son of the Virgin was not the author of our faith ; nor was he alone its finisher. The Author of our faith was the redeeming God. He became its Author by the covenant of redemption between him and the Father, ere the worlds were formed. Its finisher was the redeeming God and the redeeming man united ; the God enacting the infinite, the man the finite part. It is impossible that inspiration, unmindful of the predominating, the almost absorbing agency of the God, should have clothed the human son of the Virgin with the exclusive title of “the Author and Finisher of our faith !” He had no agency in its authorship ; he had not then himself come into being ; he was only an humble adjunct in its consummation. Yet



it was "the Author and Finisher of our faith" who had "the joy" set before him. The conclusion is inevitable that "the joy" must have been "set before" the redeeming God as well as the redeeming man.

What was "the joy that was set before" "the Author and Finisher of our faith," the Bible has not informed us distinctly; we learn, however, that it was to be a new accession of "joy;" an augmentation of pre-existent beatitude. It was a "joy" of magnitude sufficient to move a God. It was a "joy" for which the Creator as well as the creature "endured the cross, despising the shame." A chief element in this sacred "joy" of the redeeming God is, doubtless, the happiness of the sons and daughters of salvation. They were destined to be eternal prisoners in the dungeons of despair; he transformed them into rejoicing saints around the throne of the Highest. Their happiness, purchased by his sufferings, is, no doubt, reflected back upon himself in unimaginable refulgence.

"The quality of mercy is not strained.

\* \* \* \* \*

It is twice blessed:

It blesseth him that gives and him that takes."

If this is true of an earthly philanthropist, how much deeper must be its truth when applied to the

great Philanthropist of heaven ! We may judge of his “joy” in the salvation of the redeemed from his pity for their lost estate. His pity was infinite, and so must be his “joy.” His pity and his “joy” are alike beyond the comprehension of the cherubim and the seraphim. He views with complacency the material universe formed by his word ; he regards with ineffable delight the moral creation brought into being by “the travail of his soul ;” pleasant to his hearing is the music of the circling spheres ; rapturous to his heart is the anthem of praise and thanksgiving which ascends forever and ever from the mighty congregation of his redeemed children. Gethsemane and Calvary have yielded the brightest crown of glory to Him who “wears on his head many crowns.” They have poured into his divine bosom a new river of “joy,” “clear as crystal,” deep as the foundations of his throne, lasting as his eternity.

Let it not be imagined for a moment that our argument seeks to impugn the unchangeableness of the Godhead. Immutability is one of the glorious attributes of the Deity. Amid all the varieties in the divine administration, a voice is still heard from the pavilion of the Highest, “I am the Lord : I change not.”—Malachi, iii., 6. Sometimes, indeed, he appears the personification of mercy ; sometimes a “consuming fire.” It is he

who has breathed into the harps of heaven their joyous melody ; it is he who has lit up the quenchless conflagration of hell. God the Son is the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world ; he, too, is the Lion of the tribe of Judah. The voice that mourned over Jerusalem with more than a mother's tenderness will pronounce, in tones more astounding than ten thousand thunders, "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels." Nevertheless, his words and his acts, when duly understood, alike confirm the proclamation, "I am the Lord: I change not." That in him "is no variableness, neither shadow of turning," is written on the eternity of the past ; it will glow in still brighter colours on the eternity of the future.—James, i., 17.

If the imputation of suffering would cast a shade of changeableness upon him "who is over all, God blessed forever," so would his incarnation, in the view of those who seek to survey that great event through the imperfect microscope of human reason. How stupendous the seeming change, when "the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us !" What greater change could mortal imagination conceive than the transition from the celestial throne to the manger of Bethlehem ! The transformation wrought on the immutable God by his wondrous incarnation has filled even heaven

with amazement. At the right hand of power, the angelic hierarchies once beheld the spiritual Essence of the second person of the Trinity ; they now behold there, with holy curiosity and wonder, the same spiritual Essence clothed in glorified human flesh, bearing, no doubt, on his hands and feet the marks of the nails of the cross, and on his side the scar of the Roman spear.

To gain an adequate conception of the unchangeableness of the Godhead, the beholder must stand on an eminence high as heaven, and extend his comprehensive view along the illimitable tracts of eternity and immensity. Then will he find, in the incarnation and sufferings of the eternal Son, the fullest development of the immutability of the triune Deity ever revealed to mortal vision. Rather than change his unchangeable mercy, God the Son consented to become incarnate and suffer in his own divine essence, that sinners might be saved. Rather than change his unchangeable justice, God the Father "spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all." The incarnation and sufferings of God the Son were not caused by any change in the eternal counsels. The apostacy of man took not Omniscience by surprise. It had been foreseen from the beginning. The earliest eternity had registered in its archives the advent and sufferings of

the incarnate Deity, and his ascension and ceaseless reign at the right hand of the Highest. We might almost say that, before the worlds were formed, incarnation and suffering were incorporated into his very being among its constituent elements. Had God the Son not been laid in the manger of Bethlehem; had God the Son not "endured the cross;" had the cup passed from God the Son, as he for a moment so pathetically supplicated, unchangeableness must have been forever plucked from the glorious constellation of the attributes of the Godhead.

Suffering wrought no change in the decrees or purposes of the redeeming God. If it effected any change, it must, then, have been either in his essence or in his attributes. That suffering cannot change the essence of spiritual beings, is an awful truth deducible from the revealed history of the universe, past and prospective. The suffering God, then, remained identical in essence with the creating God. Nor did suffering change any of his glorious attributes. His justice, holiness, power, wisdom, truth, immutability, and love never shone so conspicuously nor harmoniously as when, made sin for sinners, he meekly submitted himself, in all his omnipotence, to the avenging sword of the Lord of Hosts. Even from the cross the ear of faith might have caught the still, deep whisper,

unheard by carnal ears, "I am the Lord : I change not."

Had God been inflexible as the imaginary fate of heathen mythology, prayer would be useless, perhaps impious ; for it would seek, by creature importunity, to move the Immoveable. But the God of the Bible is the hearer and answerer of prayer. "The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much." To the prayers of Elias the rains of heaven were made obedient.—James, v., 16, 17. Present death was denounced against Hezekiah ; yet the earnest prayer of the pious king had efficacy to

"Roll back the flood of never-ebbing time,"

and add fifteen years to the span of his life.—2 Kings, xx., 1–11. At the prayer of Moses, "the Lord repented of the evil which he thought to do unto his people."—Exodus, xxxii., 14. When the penitent cry of Nineveh was wafted towards heaven, "God saw their works that they turned from their evil way, and God repented of the evil that he had said he would do unto them, and he did it not."—Jonah, iii., 10.

But amid all these seeming changes in the purposes of the Almighty, he is still the unchanging God, "with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning." To hear and answer the

prayers of the faithful was a part of his eternal counsels, forming a constituent element of the Godhead ere the worlds were created. His patient hearing and gracious answering of prayer, in every age and every place, is, to fallen creatures, the most consolatory development of divine immutability. Should he cease to be the paternal hearer and answerer of prayer, he would cease to be himself. He would become thenceforth the changed, instead of the unchangeable God.

The very perfection and immutability of God's attributes induce mutations in his feelings and actions. A being of infinite and unchanging power, wisdom, holiness, goodness, justice, and truth, must needs have felt and acted differently towards the persecuting Saul of Tarsus, and Paul, the devoted, the exulting martyr. Upon the rebellious and fallen angels, now monuments of his righteous and unpitying wrath, the light of God's countenance once beamed, perhaps, as benignly as on his own faithful Gabriel. From everlasting to everlasting the glorious attributes of the Highest continue in unvarying perfection. But in a universe where sin has entered ; where created intelligences abound with volitions "free as air;" where the principle of good and the principle of evil contend for mastery with varying success, he "who sitteth in the heavens" is of necessity led,



by the immutability of his own infinite perfections, to mutation of emotion, and consequent mutation of action. Yet is there no real change in the unchanging God. His mutations are but the developments of his unalterable perfections. Their most astonishing development was the sacrifice of his own uncreated Son, to save our sinful and perishing world. The descending sword of the Lord of Hosts, awakened to smite his other self, was the crowning demonstration of divine immutability.

## CHAPTER XIX.

Incarnation no Proof that God the Son had not Capacity to suffer without it—Probable Reasons of Incarnation—It presented Example of perfect Man—Brought Proofs of Gospel home to Senses of Men—Rendered Triumph over Satan complete—Affords abiding Memorial of God's Justice and Love—Incarnate God, in both his Natures, obeyed the Law.

LET it not be objected, because the redeeming God took on him the "body" that was prepared for him, and became flesh and blood with "the children" he came to save, that therefore the assumption of manhood was needful to enable Omnipotence to suffer.—Heb., ii., 14 ; x., 5. Whence does the prevalent hypothesis derive this objection ? Not from the Holy Ghost. In the volume of inspired truth not a sentence is to be found intimating that destiny has surrounded the sphere of suffering with a barrier which the Almighty cannot overleap, even if he wills to pass it. It is the presumptuous objection of reasoning pride. The investiture of manhood was selected because it was deemed by infinite wisdom the most appropriate habiliment for the Saviour of our sinking race. It was selected as the suffering costume most becoming the redeeming God. Even our finite faculties can perceive many reasons why he

should suffer in the fallen nature he came to save. We would venture, with profound reverence, to suggest some of the considerations which may possibly have commended the garb of flesh to the self-devoted Deity.

First. Had he suffered in the nature of angels, or in his own incorporeal essence, he might, indeed, have paid the debts of the redeemed to the celestial treasury ; but the payment of their debts was not the sole object of his mediatorial mission. He came to rescue them, not only from the penalty, but also from the power of sin. He came, not only to save them from hell, but to prepare them for heaven. He came to breathe into them a portion of his own holiness ; to lure them upward by his own glorious example ; to make them, by his precepts and pattern, “meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light.”—Colossians, i., 12. To render his example efficacious, it must needs have been imitable. The children of humanity could not have imitated the unshrouded God. They could not even have seen him and lived.—Exodus, xxxiii., 20. To make his example imitable by man, he must of necessity have assumed the form of a man ; wherefore, “the Word was made flesh.”—John, i., 14. “Wherefore in all things it became him to be made like unto his brethren.”—Hebrews, ii., 17.

Secondly. The incarnation was necessary to secure, on earth, credence for the gospel. Man is, by nature, a skeptical animal. The unbelieving Thomas was a sample of the fallen race. Had the proofs of the miracle of redeeming love been less palpable and cogent, it could not have obtained the belief of those for whose salvation it was intended. If the angel, instead of announcing to the shepherds of Bethlehem the physical birth of a Saviour in the city of David, had proclaimed that the second person of the Trinity had redeemed our apostate race by suffering for them in his original essence, in the celestial court, "high and lifted up" above mortal ken, the messenger from heaven would have obtained few converts on earth.

To make incredulous man a believer in the stupendous scheme of redemption, sensible demonstrations were indispensable. Proofs must be accumulated on proofs. The prophetic harp must detail in advance the anticipated biography of the coming Messiah. The Messiah must be born, and live, and die, in exact fulfilment of ancient prediction. Miracles must be wrought. The wondrous star; the descending dove; the audible voice from the clouds; the transfiguration on the mount; the multiplication of the five barley loaves and two small fishes into abounding aliment for a famished

host; the obeying elements; the submissive devils; the healing of the sick; the raising of the dead; his crucifixion, with its darkened sun, and rent rocks, and trembling earth; his resurrection; his visible ascension, were all required to convince an unbelieving world that the Son of God suffered and died for its redemption. This mighty mass of proof would not have been accumulated had less sufficed. Heaven is never prodigal of display.

The feeble, hesitating, reluctant faith of man required to be confirmed by appeals to all his senses. The word of the God could not have overcome the stubbornness of incredulity. To gain from his creatures their reluctant belief, the Creator was obliged to become incarnate. Had he not become incarnate, and re-enforced, too, his appeals by a succession of stupendous miracles, he could not have made proselytes, even of his twelve disciples. Their faith, indeed, required for its aliment, not only that they should see with their eyes, but also that they should handle with their hands, of the Word of life.—1 John, i., 1. As it was, one of them betrayed him, and another denied him, and all of them fled from him in his darkened hour. Even as it now is, infidelity boldly stalks the earth, polluting with its foul breath the pure air of heaven. Even as it now is, the regenerated, the sanctified, the redeemed

children of humanity are, in this life, but half believers.

Thirdly. The incarnation of the redeeming God rendered more complete and manifest his triumph over the arch enemy. Even frail reason may perceive the fitness of the provision, that he who bruised the serpent's head should have first assumed the seed of the woman ; that his victory over the powers of darkness should have been achieved in the very world, and in the very nature which they had seduced from allegiance. This consideration, doubtless, helps to swell the exultation of heaven. This is, no doubt, the scorpion sting in the core of the hearts of the baffled princedoms reserved in chains of darkness in the prison-house of despair.

Fourthly. The incarnation has afforded an imperishable memorial of the greatest event which the flight of never-beginning ages has beheld. In the lapse of the eternity to come, Gethsemane and Calvary might, without this memorial, have faded in the recollection of created intelligences. Frail is the memory of even redeemed man. Less than infinite is the memory of the cherubim and the seraphim. But an everlasting monument of the struggles and the triumph of redeeming love has been fixed by the incarnation in the most conspic-

uous station of the universe. The redeeming God carried with him to heaven the body in which he had suffered on earth, and placed it at the right hand of the Highest. There that pierced body forever remains, its scars betokening less the lacerations of the visible irons than the unseen wounds inflicted on the uncreated Spirit of his divine Son by the viewless sword of the Lord of Hosts. With this ever-living memorial, occupying the central point of the universal empire, it is impossible that the recollection of the garden and the cross, with all their thrilling associations, should ever be dimmed by the course of ceaseless ages.

Should the harp of the weakest saint allowed to enter the New Jerusalem falter for a moment, he has but to cast his eye on the right-hand seat of the celestial throne, and those speaking scars must at once renovate his love and his zeal. Should ambition a second time insinuate itself into the angelic ranks, its aspiration must be checked and extinguished by a single glance at the right-hand seat of the celestial throne. That pierced body is an abiding memento of the awful truth that, sooner than leave sin unpunished, the eternal Father spared not his own eternal Son. It is a demonstration of the inflexibility of God's wrath against transgressions, infinitely more impressive



than the smoke which ascends forever and ever from the pit of despair. Those warning scars, symbolizing the expiatory anguish of the suffering Deity, are an everlasting beacon to guard the angelic hosts against the incipient movements of forbidden desire.

Fifthly. The redeeming God was to obey the law. It was the dishonour done to the law which

“Brought death into the world, and all our wo.”

Our great Deliverer was to restore its tarnished honour, not only by paying its penalty, but also by perfect obedience to its precepts. To make the obedience perfect, and availing, and palpable to created intelligences, incarnation was required. It was needful, not merely that the Word should be made flesh, but likewise that he should dwell among us. The obedience of the incarnate God was not in his human capacity alone. Both his natures concurred in the obedience. The God, as well as the man, obeyed the law. This is the inevitable conclusion from the language of scripture.

The man was a glorious and beautiful specimen of what our race would have been had they retained their affinity to heaven. Even the chilled eye of atheism must be sometimes inclined to melt

as it gazes on such a lovely personification of moral excellence. That a creature so pure, warned by the example of the first Adam, sustained by the consciousness of indwelling divinity, animated by "the joy set before him," should have yielded perfect obedience to a law, the counterpart of himself in holiness, was an event not likely to excite "special wonder." But the Bible speaks of the obedience of the incarnate God as a very extraordinary event. The Bible must, therefore, have referred to the obedience of the second person of the Trinity. That was the acme of wonder. For him to become obedient on earth, who had from everlasting been accustomed to supreme command in heaven, was indeed a phenomenon of gracious condescension well calculated to create astonishment in this world and in the world above.

The law obeyed by the incarnate God had three branches : the ceremonial code of the Jews ; the code promulgated at Sinai ; and the mediatorial code, formed by the covenant of redemption, between the Father and the Son, in early eternity. The incarnate God obeyed to the letter the Jewish ceremonial code. He was circumcised on the eighth day. Jerusalem and all Judea went out to be baptized of John. In conformity with this prevalent usage of his nation, the incarnate God was

baptized by his conscious and hesitating servant. The visible dove and the audible voice demonstrated that he who caused Jordan to flow was, in very truth, the recipient of its baptismal waters. The incarnate God obeyed the law promulged at Sinai. "Think not that I am come to destroy the law and the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil."—Matthew, v., 17. "For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one many shall be made righteous."—Romans, v., 19.

But the principal code to be obeyed by the incarnate God was the mediatorial code. This was emphatically the code of the Godhead. Two of the Sacred Three ordained it, ages before the birth of the infant Jesus. The second of the Sacred Three was to be its self-devoted, its obedient subject. The man was, no doubt, to obey it, according to the measure of his very limited capacity. But in the article of merit the obedience of the man bore no greater proportion to the obedience of the God than the finite bears to the infinite. The principal ingredient in the mediatorial code was its demand for expiatory suffering. It may be styled the suffering code. Of this suffering code God the Son was one of the legislators; of this suffering code God the Son was to be the victim. Here was a spectacle of blended justice,

love, and disinterestedness upon which, to eternity, the universe may gaze without satiety!

It was, indeed, a code of terrible exaction. Its penalty, if concentrated within a space shorter than eternity, could not have been endured by the united energies of created intelligences. We believe that nothing but an uncreated and almighty God could have borne it. The obedience of God the Son to this penal code is "demonstration strong," not only of his capacity to suffer, but of his actual suffering. To this code he "who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God," "became obedient unto death."—Philippians, ii., 8. "Though he were a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered."—Hebrews, v., 8. The "Son" indicated by the writer to the Hebrews was not the human son of the Virgin, but the Son of the Highest clothed in flesh.

The suffering of the uncreated Son did not render superfluous the suffering of the adjunct man. In the early age of the Christian Church—that prolific foundry of airy theories—the opinion at one time prevailed, to some extent, that the manhood of Christ suffered in appearance only. This heresy was, however, of short duration. It is not, indeed, conceivable that an incarnate Deity

should suffer in his Godhead without imparting suffering to the clay tenement in which he is enshrined.

But, without discussing the doctrine of possibilities when applied to the Omnipotent, it is enough for us to say that the blessed incarnation of the Bible would have failed in some of its apparent objects had the adjunct man remained in a condition of untouched felicity. No imitable example would have been left to the suffering faithful as a pattern of meekness and patience. There would have been no visible and palpable representation to shadow forth the atoning agonies on earth, and perpetuate their remembrance in heaven. No bloody sweat, no speaking scars would have symbolized the viewless pangs of the redeeming God. How could the man have participated with the kindred Deity, in his exaltation unless he had participated with him in his sufferings? The man, as well as the enshrined Divinity, "for the joy set before him, endured the cross, despising the shame, and is now set down at the right hand of the throne of God."—Hebrews, xii., 2.

## CHAPTER XX.

Objections to Prevalent Theory—Venerable for its Age and Prevalence—Miniature of its Outlines—Derogates from Simplicity and Fulness of Atonement—Not founded on Scripture—Imparts to Bible figurative Meaning—Lowers Affection from Godhead of Christ to Manhood—Strengthens Unitarian Error.

WE have now reached the point where it becomes necessary, in the progress of our argument, to attempt a more detailed examination of the prevalent theory than we have hitherto done. This is a delicate branch of our subject. We would not willingly aid in the demolition of a material edifice, venerable for its age, and consecrated as the scene of memorable events, however much we might complain of its architectural proportions. With how much profounder regret do we enter, with hostile purpose, that spiritual structure, which has extended over continents its vast dimensions, and grown gray under the frosts of almost fifteen hundred years! Ever since its erection, it has been the abode of the chief portion of the piety of Christendom. In its many chambers devotion has for ages uttered her dying prayers, and breathed forth her last faltering accents. From its lofty turrets, for near fifteen centuries, have triumphantly ascended joyous groups of "the spirits of just men made perfect."

That the corner-stone of this stupendous structure has been laid in error, is engraved on the tablet of our heart, as it were, by a pen of iron on tablets of marble. With the absorbing belief resting on our soul that the second person of the Trinity suffered and died, in his ethereal essence, for the redemption of our race, we cannot withhold from this sublimest of truths the aid of our feeble voice, even were we to stand alone with a world opposed. Religious misconception is not changed into truth by its prevalence or age. If errors of faith could be consecrated by their universality or antiquity, then might the paganism of China interpose against the missionaries of the Cross a rampart more impregnable than her celebrated wall interposed to Tartar incursions.

The following is a miniature representation of the prevalent theory: It affirms that the second person of the Trinity, the incarnate Redeemer of the world, suffered and died, not in his divine nature, which is impassible, but in his human nature only: that by virtue of the union of his divine and human natures, called the hypostatic union, there was imparted to his human sufferings and death a value and dignity which made them, in the estimation of infinite justice, and in pursuance of the covenant of grace between the Father and the Son, an adequate atonement for the sins of the



redeemed. This, though a brief, is believed to be a faithful sketch of the prevalent theory.

To this theory are opposed serious objections, some of which have already been intimated.

First. The theory derogates from the simplicity and fulness of the atonement, and imparts to it an illusive character. It subtracts from the atonement its vital principle. It robs it of its suffering, dying God. It substitutes the sufferings and death of the creature for the sufferings and death of the Creator. That the human son of the Virgin was a creature—as really so as Peter or John—the advocates of the prevalent theory will not deny. Nor will they affirm that mere creature sufferings could have atoned for the sins of man. For then Gabriel, instead of the eternal Son, might have been the incarnate redeemer of the world. But the prevalent theory would seek to imbue the sufferings of the creature with a borrowed value, reflected from the Creator dwelling within. How the indwelling God could impart atoning value to creature sufferings, in which he did not himself participate, but from which he stood dis severed by the immutable laws of his being, none of the faculties of man, save his imagination, can shadow forth. Sufferings, valueless as an atoning offering in themselves, could not have derived atoning

merits from the mere juxtaposition of indwelling divinity.

The intrinsic worth of a habitation would not be enhanced by the rank of its occupant. Human vanity might, indeed, attach to an edifice, proffered in satisfaction of a debt, a fictitious value, from its having been tenanted by a prince; but the calculations of human vanity would not have affected Him, who must have weighed earth's supposed offering for sin in the balance of the sanctuary, in the face of the intelligent universe. The Holder of the everlasting scales would, we suppose, have fixed the value of the offered tabernacle of clay from the intrinsic worth of its terrestrial materials, little moved by the consideration that the "Prince of life" was its tenant, and the poor oblation for a ruined world must have had written over against it the superscription so astounding to the aspiring Oriental despot, "Thou art weighed in the balances, and art found wanting."

The supposition that the chief office of the second person of the Trinity in the work of redemption was to impart, by his holy incarnation, dignity and value to creature sufferings, is the imagination of the prevalent theory. Had the communication of dignity and value to creature sufferings been the chief object of the incarnation, it

must have been somewhere intimated in the word of God. It would have formed too important a feature in the scheme of salvation to have escaped special notice. The silence of the Bible is a speaking silence. But the object of the holy incarnation is not left to be deduced by inference. The Bible everywhere indicates, in terms seemingly unequivocal, that the mission of the redeeming God was a suffering mission, and that its chief Actor was himself the principal Sufferer.

The human son of the Virgin was doubtless immeasurably exalted by his union with the Godhead. Even the ordinary Christian derives from his relationship to God a dignity far surpassing all that earth can confer. The humblest saint who drives his "team afield" may look down, as from a celestial height, on the diminished glories of a Solon or a Cæsar; for he is "the temple of the Holy Ghost." How much greater was the exaltation of the human son of Mary! Yet was he but a creature. His elevation to the throne of the Highest added not a fourth person to the Godhead. His sufferings were but creature sufferings. Nothing, save an infinite atonement, could have satisfied the requisitions of an infinite law, trampled under foot in the face of the universe. The vicarious suffering of an insect of the field, and the vicarious sufferings of legions of angels would have

been alike inefficacious. To impart infinitude to creature sufferings, infinite duration is necessary. They can be swelled into infinity only by the ceaseless tide of eternal ages.

Christ himself always assigned to his manhood a finite and inferior rank, notwithstanding its union with the Godhead. Evidence of this truth abounds in his declarations. We need here cite no particular texts to prove it. Some of them appear elsewhere in these pages. His manhood had no attribute of infinity. If, then, the manhood of Christ held only a finite rank, notwithstanding its union with the Godhead, how can the prevalent theory venture to assign an infinite rank to the exclusive sufferings of that manhood? The sufferings of his mere manhood could not rank higher than the manhood itself. If his manhood derived not infinity from union with the God, such union could not impart infinity to the sufferings of that manhood. If the union of the God took not away from Christ's humanity its creature character, neither could it have taken away from the sufferings of that humanity their creature character. As, then, the indwelling God infused nothing of infinitude into the manhood of Christ, so he infused nothing of infinitude into its sufferings. The imputation of infinite value to finite sufferings, because of the indwelling of an infinite Being, to whom

the sufferings, however, were not communicated or communicable, should, to gain credence, be sustained by clear scriptural proofs.

The prevalent theory subtracts from the atonement of the Bible, not only its infinitude, but also its ineffable dignity. This thought has been partially developed in an early part of our argument; but its importance seemed to require its farther expansion in this connexion.

Meeting full in the face the very numerous passages of scripture ascribing sufferings to the divinity of Christ in terms not to be parried, the prevalent theory, to avoid too palpable a collision with Holy Writ, was obliged to allege that, by the hypostatic union of the divine and human natures in one person, the sufferings of the man became, in scriptural estimation, the sufferings of the God, not by actual endurance, but by adoption or construction. These are the views expressed, as we have seen, by Bishops Pearson and Beveridge; and without some such aliment, the hypostatic theory could not have subsisted. The redeeming God, then, is to be taken as the principal redeeming sufferer, constructively, according to the prevalent theory, actually, according to ours. As it regards its bearing on this particular point of our argument, it is not material whether his suffering was

actual or constructive. It is enough for the present point, that in scriptural estimation the God suffered ; that the suffering is predicated of him who hath "weighed the mountains in scales, and the hills in a balance."—Isaiah, xl., 12.

Suffering consists in the reduction of what would otherwise have been the happiness of the sufferer. The amount of the reduction tells the amount of the suffering. The happiness of the incarnate God, but for his suffering, would have been infinite. He imbodyed the fulness of the beatitude of the Godhead. According to the prevalent theory, his suffering was finite. It reached his humanity alone. It was only the suffering of the finite man. It touched but the outer garment of the indwelling God. Subtract finite suffering from infinite beatitude, and the reduction must be too small for creature perception. It would elude, by its minuteness, the arithmetic of earth, and, as we suppose, the arithmetic of angels.

If you take a drop from the bucket and a drop from the ocean, the loss of the bucket will be incomparably greater than the loss of the illimitable sea ; for its capacity to lose with impunity is proportionally less than the capacity of the ocean. Christ, if his divinity tasted not "the cup of trembling," was happier even in the garden and on the

cross than any created intelligence to be found in this lower world or in the heavens above. His was the ocean of divine blessedness. The subtraction of the drop of human woe caused a less diminution than would be caused to an ocean of earth by the subtraction of a single drop of its "multitudinous" waters ; for the oceans of earth have their shores ; the ocean of divine blessedness is shoreless. Thus the prevalent theory would sink those expiatory sufferings, which satisfied the divine law and redeemed the world, from their scriptural infinitude down to a point less, taken in reference to the illimitable beatitude of the sufferer, than a single particle of the dust of the balance. "Tell it not in Gath, publish it not in the streets of Ascalon," lest the spiritually uncircumcised should rejoice.

Secondly. The prevalent theory, with its hypostatic subordinate, has not its foundation in the Word of God. According to the scriptural representation, the redeeming sufferer appeared, not as a secondary planet, borrowing light and lustre from a central sun ; he was himself the central Sun of his own system of grace, shining in his own brightness. He was not the outer man, deriving dignity from the impassible God within ; he was the suffering God, wearing the form of the outer man, but as the sinless representative of the



fallen nature he came to save. The Bible everywhere gives to the redeeming sufferer the primary, and not the secondary place. On the scriptural canvass, the redeeming God is always depicted as the principal Sufferer. It was the "Prince of life" who was "killed;" it was the "Lord of glory" who was "crucified;" it was the Son of man "that came down from heaven" who gave "his life a ransom for many;" it was the shepherd God who gave "his life for the sheep;" it was God's "only-begotten Son" whom he "sent into the world" "to be the propitiation for our sins;" it was the uncreated Son by whose "death" we were reconciled to God; it was the Father's "own Son" whom he "spared not;" it was "the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person," who "purged our sins;" it was God who "laid down his life for us;" it was with the blood of God that he purchased his Church; it was to smite his "Fellow" that the Lord of Hosts awakened his slumbering sword; it was He that "thought it not robbery to be equal with God," who "emptied himself," and "became obedient unto death;" it was the "Alpha and Omega," who "was dead and is alive again," and behold, he liveth forever more. From Genesis to Revelation, both inclusive, there is no text, within our recollection, intimating that "the Word was made flesh" merely to impart dignity and value to crea-

ture sufferings. The hypostatic scheme is too complicated, too involved, too artificial for gospel simplicity and directness. It bears the marks of the chisel of art. It has been formed in the laboratories of earth.

Was strength for the endurance of creature sufferings needed? That strength might have been imparted to the human son of the Virgin by the mere mandate of the God. The mandate of Almighty God is wide-reaching and resistless. He commanded, and there was light. He spake, and from the opening east appeared the king of day, rejoicing in his might. He commanded, and straightway began the ceaseless dance of the harmonious spheres. His mandate was the chariot of fire in which the translated Elijah ascended to heaven. It was his mandate which closed the mouths of the famished lions, so that they harmed not the faithful prophet. His mandate opened the fountain of waters above, and the depths below, so that a mighty deluge overflowed the mountains of the earth. His mandate will one day melt with fervent heat the elements of the material universe. His mandate, without his becoming incarnate, might, doubtless, have imparted all needful strength to the human son of the Virgin.

If, then, God was made "manifest in the flesh,"

not to strengthen his terrestrial adjunct, or merely to impart dignity and value to creature sufferings, what could have been the object of his incarnation? Scripture has intimated no other object—imagination can conceive no other—than the redemption of the world and the manifestation of infinite justice by suffering in his own divine essence. This is the grand central point in the system of salvation, to which we are drawn from all our wanderings by the centripetal attraction of almighty truth.

An infinite object, of a twofold aspect, was presented to the conclave of the Godhead. A world was to be saved. Divine justice was to be vindicated. That arch enemy, who had once threatened the throne of the Highest, and was waving his triumphant banner over one of the fairest provinces of the universal empire created by the eternal Son, was to be consigned to chains of everlasting darkness. The eternal Son, who had once baffled that enemy in heaven, was to complete his conquest on earth. A new, and “strange,” and glorious development of infinite love was to be displayed. A new, and “strange,” and awful demonstration of infinite justice was to astound the universe—to be reverberated through eternity. The second person in the Trinity, in the fulness of time, descended from heaven, and shrouded his

divinity in the vestment of flesh. It was the descent of a God ; and his movements on earth were to be the footsteps of a God. His absence from the celestial court was not merely that he might pass through the ceremony of incarnation, and thence return, untouched by pain, to his native heavens, wearing on his triumphant brow the cheap-earned trophies of an enemy subdued and a world redeemed. The trophies which he earned on earth were earned by the bloody sweat, the viewless, nameless agonies of a suffering, dying God. It was not for the purpose of a ceremonious incarnation ; it was that, with divine throes and spasms unimaginable by men or angels, he might save a perishing race, and fix on adamant foundations the everlasting column of infinite justice, that he left vacant—if we may so say—for more than thirty years of what we call time, the right-hand seat of the celestial throne.

Thirdly. The prevalent theory imparts a figurative signification, not merely to a few inspired passages, but to all that mighty mass of scriptural truths which, having for their basis the sufferings of Christ, constitute the sinews, and arteries, and very heart of the Bible. By figurative signification we mean every departure from the literal and obvious import of the words interpreted, by whatever name the authors of such departure may

choose to characterize it. That the vital elements of the Bible consist in the expiatory agonies of the incarnate God, no Christian will doubt. It is the merit of those sufferings which renders it the book of hope, the star of comfort, the rock of confidence. What would have been the Bible without the atoning pangs of Christ? It would have been a desert of cheerless sands, with no spot of recreating green, no cooling spring to cheer the mournful journey from the cradle to an unquiet grave.

If the abounding scriptural passages declarative of Christ's sufferings are to be received in their literal and obvious import, then the conclusion that his Godhead participated in his expiatory agonies is just as certain as the conclusion that his Godhead became incarnate. This great central truth of the Bible has received the seal of each august person of the Trinity. The Holy Ghost promulged it often in the Old Testament, and unceasingly in the New. The blessed Son proclaimed it from the time he began to preach glad tidings on earth until his stupendous reappearance at Patmos. The infinite Father confirmed it when he summoned his sleeping sword to awake and smite his Fellow. This great central truth has passed into scriptural demonstration, if the asseverations of the Bible are not to be lost in

allegory. The Bible and the prevalent theory stand in direct collision. To escape the dilemma, the theory invokes its transmuting powers. The scriptural truths must be made to evaporate in metaphor, or the theory of fifteen centuries cannot be sustained.

There is nothing on the face of the scriptural passages indicating a figurative meaning. Their conversion into figures of speech is not required or justified by any other portions of Holy Writ. The subject matter of the passages would seem to interdict figurative interpretation. The Holy Ghost is recounting the sufferings and death of his brother God. Pathos, when profound, is wont to select, for the outpourings of the heart, the plainest and most simple terms to be found in speech. "Jesus wept" and "It is finished" are akin, in expressive brevity and grandeur, to that most concise, yet most sublime of sentences, "God said, Let there be light, and there was light."

Theological science has no authority delegated from above to veil the simplicity of scriptural truth beneath drapery woven in the looms of earth. On this theme we would, if in our power, give such compass to the voice of our feeble remonstrance as to make it heard and felt in every school of sacred lore. Even a human record is held sacred.

It carries on its face incontrovertible verity. It speaks for itself; and its responses are unalterable as the imagined decrees of classic fate. It cannot be impeached from without. Should the attempt be made, the mandatory voice of the law would exclaim, "Travel not out of the record." An effort to turn into figures of speech its plain and simple language would indicate aberration of intellect. The Bible is a heavenly record. It was indited by the third of the Sacred Three, and sealed with the blood of the second. Of this inspired record, the Holy Ghost is the interpreter. God is the expounder of the words of God.

Theological lore may evolve the latent meaning of scripture, by comparing sacred texts with sacred texts, for that still leaves it to God to explain himself. It may borrow elucidations from scriptural history and scriptural geography, for they are constituent, though inferior parts of the sacred volume. It may treat particular passages as figurative, if necessary to preserve the symmetry of scripture. It may, for instance, teach us to believe that the scriptural delineations of the corporeal lineaments of the disembodied Deity are figurative, because we are elsewhere taught in the Bible that "God is a Spirit." But where the scriptural terms themselves indicate no departure from directness of meaning, and come not into collision



with other parts of Holy Writ, academic science has no right to plant in the sacred soil metaphors of human growth. A still, small voice ever whispers from above, "*Travel not out of the record of God.*" The conversion of plain language into figurative language may shake the foundations of our faith. It may fearfully "add unto," or "take away from the book" of life, which closed with the last chapter of Revelation. The imputation of metaphorical signification to the sacred and clear passages declarative of Christ's agonies subtracts from the atonement of the Bible its suffering God, and sinks the great expiatory sacrifice from its scriptural infinitude down to a finite atom.

The boldest development of reasoning pride is the right which it often claims and exercises to construe scripture by its own microscopic views of what is "fitting to God." This dangerous error formed, as we have seen, the major proposition of the Athanasian syllogism. Without it, the prevalent theory might not have held Christendom in its fetters for fifteen successive centuries. Stand forth, reasoning pride, and let us commune together. You say that it is not "fitting to God" to suffer, even from his own free volition and sovereign choice. And what think you, then, of the holy incarnation? Declare. Is it "fitting to God," the infinite Spirit, to have "been made flesh, and

dwelt among us?" Is it "fitting to God," the great God, to have been born in a manger, and wrapped in its straw? Is it "fitting to God," the architect of the universe, to have been a laborious journeyman in the workshop of Joseph? Is it "fitting to God," accustomed to the ministration of angels, to have washed the feet of his betraying and deserting disciples? Is it "fitting to God," the object of heaven's hallelujahs, to have submitted in meekness to the scoffings, and scourgings, and spittings of the blaspheming mob? When you have responded to all these interrogatories, you may be the better able to appreciate the soundness of your favourite dogma, that it is not "fitting to God" to suffer.

Fourthly. The prevalent theory tends to lower the eye of devotion from the Godhead of Christ to his manhood. To worship the created humanity of Mary's son alone, would be idolatrous worship. To love the glorified man more than the indwelling God, would be impiously loving the creature more than the Creator. We should love the whole united being of Christ. We should love the finite much; the infinite unspeakably more. The instinct of our nature leads us to regard, with peculiar favour, him who has bestowed on us signal benefits, especially if the tomb has closed over our benefactor. Affection preserves in fond remem-

brance the gift of a departed friend. A grateful country bedews, with overflowing tears, the grave of the patriot who has suffered and died for its sake. And if we are taught to consider the pathetic story of Christ's agonies and death as but the biography of the human son of the Virgin, and to regard the indwelling God, through all his incarnation, as standing aloof from pains, wrapped in the mantle of impassibility, our warm affections may be drawn too much from the impassible God, and placed too fondly on the suffering man. In blotting out from the scriptural picture the soul-absorbing and soul-expanding agonies of the incarnate Deity, and fixing the mental vision on the suffering manhood of Christ, the prevalent theory gives the human figure too attractive a place on the canvass. It tends to impair the spirituality and sublimity of worship, and to sink devotion, as it were, from heaven down to earth.

Fifthly. The prevalent theory unwittingly strengthens the Unitarian error. The startling syllogism of Arius stood thus : The divine essence is impassible : Christ suffered in both his celestial and human natures ; therefore, his celestial nature was not divine. Had the Council of Nice made but a single thrust at the major proposition of this syllogism, the heresy of Arius would scarcely have outlived its author. But, unfortunately, the fa-

thers of the Nicene Council assented to its major proposition; they conceded the hypothesis of God's impassibility. They had then nothing left but to declare against its minor proposition—the suffering of Christ in his united natures—a dubious war. Modern Unitarianism, except in its very lowest grade, rests on the same identical syllogism.

We regard the Unitarian heresy as the most formidable foe of our holy religion. The polar region of wintry Atheism is bound in its own eternal frosts. Professed Infidelity can never be perennial where the warm pulsations of the human heart are felt. The creative spirit of a Hume or a Gibbon may, ever and anon, breathe into it the breath of precarious life; but, whenever the strong stimulant of sustaining genius is withdrawn, it sinks down, like Thomas Paine, a lifeless, offensive, and forgotten corse. But Unitarianism, decked in the beautiful habiliments of the social virtues, is a brilliant and dangerous meteor. Under its ever-changing phases and varying names it has, like a portentous comet, threatened the system of Christian faith for more than fifteen centuries.

The inquirer after truth, while dwelling on the atonement of the prevalent theory, finds that the view of its creature sufferings leaves an aching

void in his heart. This unsatisfied vacuity ever invites the intrusion of seductive, and often fatal errors. If Christendom would extirpate the Unitarian heresy, let a concentrated blow be aimed at the major proposition of its upholding syllogism. Wrest from it its earth-woven mantle of the divine impassibility. Strip it of its armour of proof. That Christ suffered in his united natures is a position deeply bedded in the everlasting truth of sacred writ. The hypothesis of God's impassibility has no foundation in his holy word. Divine impassibility is the chief corner-stone of the Unitarian faith. Remove that corner-stone, and the whole structure will totter to its foundation.

## CHAPTER XXI.

Practical Effects of Doctrine of Divinity of Christ's Sufferings—  
Deepens Views of Sin—Exalts Justice of God—His Love—Magnifies Value of Soul—Affords sure Foundation of Christian Confidence—Elevates Views of Atonement.

WE shall doubtless be accused of attempting to disturb one of the ancient landmarks of Christian faith. That this attempt is not a wanton innovation, may have appeared from the preceding pages. Yet farther to vindicate and illustrate our discussion, it will be useful, at the hazard of some seeming, though not real repetition, to state succinctly the respective and opposing bearings of the prevalent theory, and of that which we advocate, upon some of the cardinal points of our holy religion. It will thence become manifest that our views are as salutary in practice as they are well-founded in scriptural authority.

First. The development of the stupendous truth that the eternal Son, “manifest in the flesh,” suffered and died, in his own ethereal essence, for the redemption of the world, unfolds to our apprehension new and more appalling exhibitions of the potency and turpitude of sin than are presented by the prevalent theory. If we have confidence

in the wisdom of an earthly physician, we are best taught the extremity of a physical malady by learning the extremity of the means to which he is driven for its cure. Should he find himself obliged, by efforts beyond mortal endurance, to sacrifice his own life for the life of his patient, it would be an affecting demonstration, not only of his matchless compassion, but also of the inveterate malignancy of the disease, which he could not otherwise assuage.

There is a principle of evil in the universe second only to Omnipotence in its fearful power. It once, with exulting hopes of success, unfurled its standard of rebellion in the very capital of the empire of the Highest, within the sound of the thunders of his almighty throne, drawing after it one third part of the bright intelligences of heaven. To check this principle of evil, and confine it within secure limits, without infringing the freedom of creature volition and action, requires from infinite wisdom, perhaps, its highest development. This evil principle is not less blighting than it is potent. It has converted our terrestrial Eden into a howling wilderness. It is the creator and eternal preserver of its own indwelling hell. Sin's own unchanging laws, engraven on tablets which time cannot moulder, have immutably ordained that every creature of this or any other world, who



transgresses, must bid adieu to bliss, unless there be a renovation of his moral nature. He will forever carry within him the undying worm. His own breast must be the everlasting receptacle and feeder of the quenchless, yet unconsuming fire. He cannot escape it by flight :

“ For within him hell  
He brings, and round about him, nor from hell  
One step, no more than from himself, can fly  
By change of place.”

These awful yet salutary truths are best brought home to the soul by a close meditation, not only on the visible death of expiation at Calvary, but also, and beyond measure more especially, on the spiritual crucifixion of the only-begotten, the eternal Son of the Highest. How fearfully deleterious must be that wide-spread principle of evil, the mere local development of which required, as a preliminary to its pardon, such an atoning sacrifice ! How frightful must have been the virulence of that moral malady, which could only be cured by the blood of God !

Secondly. We would not, by limiting the expiatory sufferings to the manhood of Christ, detract, as the prevalent theory unspeakably detracts, from the sublime exhibition of the justice of the triune God, manifested in the great work of redemption, and portrayed with such ineffable simplicity, pa-

thos, and power in the sacred oracles. The execution of the scriptural scheme of the atonement, whose vicarious victim was the architect of the worlds, elicited a development of the inflexible justice of the Godhead, new and "strange" in the annals of eternity. Compared with it, the expulsion of the third part of heaven from their blessed abodes; compared with it, the impassable ramparts of hell, and its adamantine vaults, and quenchless fires, and ceaseless wailings, might pass without special wonder, we would almost say, as pertaining to the ordinary administration of the system of penal jurisprudence, ordained by a wise and righteous God for the government of his boundless empire.

But if permitted to behold a scene, perhaps too sacred for creature vision, how must the hierarchies of heaven have stood aghast, as the Ancient of Days, arrayed in the most awful habiliments of avenging omnipotence, drew forth from its long repose his own almighty sword—the sharpest weapon in the armory of the Godhead—to smite—as a God alone could smite, and with an effect which a God alone could endure—the beloved and unresisting fellow of his everlasting reign! Let not the dwellers upon the earth be taught to regard this sublimest of scriptural delineations as magnificent imagery alone, fitly evolv-

ed by Oriental metaphor. To suppose that the Lord of Hosts awakened his slumbering sword—slumbering, perhaps, from the earliest eternity—to smite the mere frail humanity of him who was cradled in the manger, would be to sink, in mortal estimation, this stupendous scene in the annals of the Godhead from the infinite down to the finite.

That demonstration of infinite justice which forms the prominent and august feature of the atonement consists in the awful truth that God the Father “spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all.” And ever mark the mighty terms “his own Son !” The theory of earth, which virtually holds that the eternal Son was spared ; that the unspared one of the Father was but the human son of Mary ; that the eternal Son suffered no more to redeem our fallen race than he did in their creation, robs the atonement of all its magnificence. Let it not be alleged that God the Father “spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all,” and thus satisfied the plenitude of the declaration of the Holy Ghost, when, for a space brief compared with eternity, he allowed him to depart from the celestial courts, and to dwell on earth in a tabernacle of clay, carrying, however, with him the undiminished beatitude of the Godhead, in the same way as an earthly father may be said to spare not his own son, but to deliv-

er him up, when he sends him from the domestic hearth, to sojourn for a season in foreign climes ! We would not willingly impute to the prevalent theory so irreverent a prostration of the majesty of the atonement.

Thirdly. Nor would we derogate, as the prevalent theory immeasurably derogates, from the infinite love displayed by the triune God in the redemption of the world. Let it never be forgotten that the sending of his well-beloved Son by the infinite Father to be the ransom of our fallen race, and the voluntary acceptance of that terrible mission by the infinite Son, and the contributory agency of the Holy Ghost to render the mission efficacious, are everywhere represented in scripture as the concentration and sublimation of the ineffable love of the united Godhead ; compared with which the displays of divine goodness, in the variegated works of creation, sink, as it were, into comparative unimportance. It was a distant and twilight glimpse of this sublime development of infinite love that awakened to such unearthly harmony the consecrated harps of the prophets and inspired patriarchs of old. It was a clearer view of this stupendous miracle of grace, unmatched even by the Godhead, that ever and anon roused the profoundly argumentative Paul to such bursts of holy rhapsody. It was this view, melt-

ing the heart of the beloved disciple, which prompted that simplest, that most touching, that most comprehensive and expressive of scriptural sentences, "God is love."

And do all these sublime indications of scripture point, indeed, to nothing but the simple fact that the second person of the Trinity, by the mandate of the Father and his own volition, condescendingly and graciously came into the world, to occupy for a time, in all the perfection of infinite beatitude, the "body" that was prepared for him, and then to return, untouched by suffering, to his celestial home, and there receive the rapturous gratulations of heaven on his having just created, from a moral chaos, a new spiritual world, more glorious than any of those which, at the beginning of time, had roused the swelling anthem of the "morning stars?" Such is not the scriptural picture of the love of the Godhead displayed in the redemption of the world.

Fourthly. If we may justly conclude that the second person of the Trinity, clothed in flesh, suffered and died for the redemption of the human soul, not in his manhood alone, but also in his Godhead, the conclusion will impart new and ineffable value to the immaterial, breathing, living, immortal principle within us. Seneca, the heathen phi-

losopher, termed the soul a "little god cased in flesh." The Bible imparts to it a rank higher than was ever imagined in the dreams of pagan mythology. God formed material man "of the dust of the ground ;" but he "breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul." The soul of man, then, is an emanation of the Deity. It is a spirit kindred to the ethereal essence of its almighty Creator. Christ, while on earth, interrogatively declared that it would be a losing contract for a man to barter, for the whole world, his own soul. This theoretic proposition, like other abstract truths, even of the Bible, is best brought home to the heart by practical elucidation. If we would see it thus illustrated by its divine Author, let us stand beside his viewless cross, and, in contemplating his unseen spiritual and divine sufferings for its ransom, learn at what price the soul was rated in the celestial exchequer.

If man would become familiar with the distant bodies of the material heavens, let him borrow of science its glorious instrument of discovery, which will enable him to walk.

" Abroad through nature, to the range  
Of planets, suns, and adamantine spheres,  
Wheeling unshaken through the void immense."

The science of sacred truth, too, has its telescope ;

and if we would gain still clearer views of the value of the breathing immortality within us, let us, through that consecrated medium of vision, fix our steadfast and wondering gaze on the onward flight of a single soul through the ages of its eternity. It must sink "a goblin damned," or rise a spirit of bliss. In the rank soil of the world of blasphemy, it will, in successive ages, swell to a mammoth of guilt; or, in the pure atmosphere of heaven, it will, in its upward progress, brighten into an archangel, ministering before the throne of God. The prospective omniscience of the infinite Son, standing by the grave of a world "dead in trespasses and sins," beheld its countless perishing souls, of value too precious to be ascertained, save by the arithmetic of heaven. He pitied—he redeemed; he redeemed by the immolation of himself. Great was the price; greater, in the estimate of infinite love, was the redemption purchased.

Beautiful and glorious is the material universe. Beautiful is our own queen of night; glorious our own king of day. Brilliant are yonder stars that spangle the firmament; surpassingly majestic when we regard them as centres of their own expanding systems, attracting and ruling their own wheeling orbs. But to save all these, the Son of God would not have died; to redeem them all from



one vast consuming conflagration, he would not have laid down his most precious life. He could have spoken new suns and systems into being. To impart moral life to a single soul dead in iniquity, he was obliged to die himself. When seen in the scriptural mirror, why will not man learn to appreciate that deathless soul, whose matchless value is so well known in heaven? Why will man, reckless man, madly throw away that inestimable gem, whose ransom cost the death of a God? How could centuries have cherished a theory which, by sinking, without scriptural authority, the redeeming price, would lower, in the estimation of the dwellers upon the earth, the value of their immortal souls;

Fifthly. The sufferings of Christ, in his Godhead, afford a foundation for Christian confidence unknown to the prevalent theory. The anxious inquirer after religious truth, from whose eyes the scales have begun to fall, gazes, now at the frightful turpitude of sin, now at the "consuming fire" of Jehovah's wrath. He hears, close behind him, the cry of the avenger of blood. He must reach a city of refuge, or miserably perish. The prevalent theory points him to one. He finds it built of creature sufferings. In vain, at least for the time, is urged the dignity and atoning value imparted to the sufferings by the juxtaposition of in-

dwelling divinity. He searches, without success, for any traces of the theory in Holy Writ. Metaphysical speculation soothes not his sin-tossed spirit. It is an icicle to his soul. He must become an adept in the prevalent theory before he can cast himself, for eternity, on vicarious sufferings less than divine.

Perhaps, gentle reader, you may yourself be an anxious, and, as yet, unbiased inquirer after religious truth. You may be seeking, as for hidden treasure, a sure foundation for the sinner's hope. Turn, then, to the Book of books. Read the concurrent testimony of the blessed Trinity, that its glorious second person endured the infinite burden of the vicarious sufferings to save our perishing world; to save even you, if you will but accept his "great salvation." Deign to believe the declarations of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, in all their stupendous magnitude. Accept as true, and sincere, and ingenuous, the assurances of the Sacred Three, though pertaining to things incomprehensible to your microscopic vision. Degrade not the atonement of the Godhead, by imagining that its second person suffered by profession and in name only. Change not into figures of speech the plain and simple proclamations which came down from above.

The anxious, fearing, trembling inquirer after gospel truth, bewildered on a sea of doubt and darkness, without a compass or a star, may find, in the sufferings of the Godhead of Christ, "an anchor of the soul, both sure and steadfast, and which entereth into that within the veil;" "an anchor" formed in the conclave of the holy Trinity; "sure" as its eternal decrees; "steadfast" as the pillars of its everlasting throne. Christian confidence, founded on the expiatory agonies of the Creator of the worlds, may look down, as from the heaven of heavens, on all that this poor earth miscalls "sure and steadfast." He who has the witness within himself that he is to be partaker in the salvation wrought by the divine sufferings of the dying God, may, from the depths of his grateful, weeping, joyous heart, triumphantly exclaim with the exulting apostle to the Gentiles, "I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that He is able to keep that which I have committed to him against that day."

Sixthly. We delight to dwell on the atonement, built of the sufferings and cemented by the blood of God, in all its scriptural magnificence. It is, beyond peradventure, the mightiest effort of almighty power. God spake, and chaos became a universe of moving worlds. He could not speak into being the structure of salvation. Its forma-

tion cost him his incarnation, his sufferings, his death. It is the rainbow glory of heaven, concentrating in mild, yet bright effulgence, the mingling and harmonious rays of infinite justice, infinite wisdom, and infinite love. Upon the just proportions, the beautiful simplicity, the exquisite symmetry, the lofty grandeur of this choicest pavilion of the Godhead, the holy curiosity of cherubim and seraphim will be riveted for countless ages after time shall be no more. It will be remembered in hell. Devils will gnash their teeth; but "devils damned" dare not, cannot scoff. Forever must they gaze on this wonder of wonders, this everlasting monument of their Conqueror's triumph, in silent, in speechless despair.

What gives to this structure its transcendent majesty is the divinity of the sufferings of which it was composed. Had not the throes and blood of its suffering, dying, risen God pervaded and formed its constituent elements, it would have been a splendid pageant that might dazzle, but could not satisfy created intelligences. Let not the children of men seek to mar its beauty or dim its glory. It was on earth that its foundations were laid. It is earth that it has redeemed. Let not earth alone, of all the provinces of the universal empire, seek to pluck from this temple of salvation its everlasting corner-stone.

## APPENDIX.

---

### ARGUMENT OF ATHANASIUS, REFERRED TO AT PAGE 40.

---

AGAINST THOSE WHO ASSERT THAT, BECAUSE GOD SO WILLED.  
HE SUFFERED.

As the traveller avoids every wandering from his road, and would suffer any inconvenience sooner than leave the highway, thus the pilgrims in the path of sound doctrine follow the footprints of those who never leave the way; and when they have learned the landmarks of their journey, they guard against any departure therefrom, and so are always guided in the truth. But some disregard this aim, and please themselves in unbelief, and abandon the footsteps of the orthodox fathers, and the landmarks that the divine instructors have set up, and follow by-paths, some discovered by heretics of old, some, at the present time, by themselves. Thus they assert this unreasonable dogma: God suffered because he so willed. Being unable to demonstrate the passibility of God's nature, they do not hesitate to utter untruths concerning his will; and if questioned concerning the Divine nature, their answer relates to his will. If God's nature were capable of suffering, then it might be permitted to consider his will; but though, for the sake of argument, such a volition were conceded many times, yet could that concession not shake the immoveable laws of Nature. What madness, then, to assert, that he suffered because he so willed! What rational man is unaware that will and nature must harmonize? That the ends of nature and the ends of volition must unite, is a truth self-evident; and equally so that their limits are fixed, and their aims regulated by nature and intelligence. He that

would assert the contrary would put nature and the will in hostile array, the latter longing for that which is impossible, or the former admitting conditions elementally destructive to itself. That essence that, by its constitution, setting will aside, may admit suffering is passible; but that essence, which in its nature and being is inconsistent with suffering, may not assume the condition of passibility, though its will may strongly thereto consent. Each class of animated beings retains the law and form of its first creation, and maintains it irreversibly. Should man oftentimes and earnestly desire to be a bird, yet would nature as often overcome that will; should he long for the spirit of an unreasoning brute, yet would it be but a foolish thought and an unaccomplished design. Now as Nature thus displays her unconquerable power, and her superiority to the despotism of all opposing volitions, shall the unchanging and undying essence of God alone yield itself to be shackled by the will? Wonderful thought! Shall that which guards with watchful care all essences, and conserves each in its sphere, shall that alone be thus easily driven from the bounds of impassibility, and God the Creator possess less inflexibility than he has bestowed on every creature? But let us inquire of what prophet or apostle they receive this erroneous doctrine, that he thus willed? From none. The error springs from and rests on the light authority of those who maintain it. We have neither read he suffered, nor found he willed to suffer. What holy man ever saw suffer the invisible and impassible God, or to whom hath he revealed such a will? O the boldness of man to trample over invisible powers! For who hath ascended into heaven? who transcended thrones, principalities, powers, dominions, majesties? Who hath flown beyond the flight of the seraphim? Who hath seen the things concealed from their eyes? Who hath found out the nature of God in volition and suffering, when the Scriptures have not revealed it? We have heard that he hath performed his good pleasure; but that he suffered, and because he willed, we have nowhere learned. Why, then, mingle instability with unchangeabili-

ty? This is madness, not wisdom. The truth is the reverse of this. Christ suffered, indeed, but it was in the flesh of mortal men, and not in his immortal Word.

AGAINST THOSE WHO ASSERT THAT THE EXPRESSIONS OF SCRIPTURE SHOULD BE RECEIVED LITERALLY, WITHOUT REGARD TO THEIR TRUE MEANING AND SPIRITUAL IMPORT.

With great difficulty are those silenced who would subvert the constitution of the human mind, restraining men from the exercise of reason, and from the knowledge of natural truth and loveliness, by telling their followers that the expressions of Holy Writ are to be received literally, without examination, without discussion, without comparison, and without reference to the end for which they have been uttered. If, then, as they counsel, men should overlook the end and the meaning of the expressions of Scripture, and receive them literally and irrationally, would it not be to allow the words of apostles and prophets to echo through the ears in vain and unfruitful sounds, while the heart remained untouched and unaffected? When they advise to listen with the ears, but strive not for that fruitful perception which belongs to the heart, the curse attaches to them, to listen with the ears and not perceive. Thus they say, the phrase, "the Word became flesh," is to be understood literally, and not in the sense pious reason would put upon the words; as if it were in their power to wrest the conception of any person from that which is befitting and profitable to that which pleases themselves. Shall I listen to words, and seek not for the idea intended thereby to be conveyed? Where, then, would be the results of discourse and the profit of listening? How quickly would they transform men into unreasoning beasts by such propositions; to listen to sounds of words and neglect the deductions of reason. Paul, who was a teacher in such affairs, did not thus instruct; his precepts were, to receive nothing save upon the sanction of right reason; thus, solid food belongs to grown men, who by exercise are able to discriminate be-



tween good and evil. He advises perfection, praises exercise, recommends a sober judgment between good and evil. But how can he judge who discerns not the matters revealed? For, as the man whose senses are disordered by disease has no true perception of aliments nor their properties, so the man who, from idleness or stolidity, is unexercised in his mental faculties, apprehends the words he hears, but gathers not the force of the argument, nor perceives the distinctions in the ideas intended to be conveyed. His participation is heedless and irrational; like the beast who devours the nutritive and hurtful as they may chance to offer. Nor is he to be numbered among clean beasts, since he does not ruminate, but transmits a crude and unprepared mass of mental food to the inner man. Thus he receives injury from imperfect digestion, rather than support to his vital powers. Is any one ignorant that the command of the Divine law enjoins a scrutiny upon him who is bidden to sup at the table of a ruler, and diligently to consider what is placed before him? Thus, it is manifest that we are not to make the words of Scripture our prey, but we must consider what is *fitting to God*, useful to man, consonant with truth, in harmony with the law, responsive to nature; to that which faith may know, on which hope may build and the sincerity of love adopt, whereby the glory of God may shine untarnished, envy be vanquished, grace justified. These elements co-exist in the meditations of piety, but find no place in these absurd novelties, whose dependance is upon mad theories. To conclude, he who receives the texts of Scripture literally and neglects the meaning cannot understand passages that seem to clash; he can find no proper solution thereto, give no answer to inquiries, and cannot fulfil the precept, be careful always to have that whereby thou mayest answer him who inquires.

AGAINST THOSE WHO ASSERT THAT GOD THE WORD SUFFERED  
IN THE FLESH.

I wonder that the inventors of these new doctrines seem never tired in their search or introduction of novelties, but are always frivolously propounding theories like the one we now proceed to confute, that God the Word suffered in the flesh. In this proposition there is much that is irrational, and much that is untrue. It is irrational to say one nature suffered in another ; untrue to say the Word suffered. That which they would not dare to express unqualifiedly they conceal by the addition of "the flesh;" thus they would cover up this revolting idea, in the same manner as is an ugly face, by a deceitful mask. If the Word suffered, he suffered in his own essence. If aught else suffered, then the Word did not suffer, unless that injury which was directed alone against the suffering body may be considered as recoiling on the Word thereto united. To say, however, the Word suffered in the flesh is unscriptural, untrue, self-contradictory. But as these men are unbounded in impiety, and are conscious that pious ears will not listen to the expression "the Word suffered," they subjoin the expression "the flesh," in order to heal the wounds wrought by the other. Thus they would introduce disease, and heal by improper remedies ; for none of these doctrines are consonant with truth ; and frequently in the same sentence are contained contradictions, so that rational men can give them no attention. The Word was not rendered passible by being joined to the flesh, nor was the flesh impassible through the agency of the Word ; but as the body, by its nature, admitted the influence of suffering, so the Word retained impassibility, as an essential and inseparable attribute. If the Word suffered, why subjoin the addition "in the flesh?" Why mention the flesh ? The body suffered with the Word, or it did not. If it did not suffer, impassibility was bestowed on it. If it suffered, then the proof is that both natures suffered ; for, as they say, the Word suffered in the flesh, and the body, by its own consti-

tution, suffered in its proper nature. But perhaps the declaration of the apostle may be urged, "Of whom, as concerning the flesh, is Christ." Say Christ suffered, and the word flesh recurs in the same manner. He who names God the Word names a pure essence; he who names Christ designates one in whom two natures are united; and thus it is with propriety we say Christ suffered, because this name implies at once the impassible Word and the body which tasted death. Wherefore Paul did not use the expression, of whom is the pure God after the flesh, but "Of whom is Christ after the flesh," in order that he might indicate him who was intended of the Israelites, as pertains to the body; but as pertains to his divinity, the begotten of God the Father. He did not say, of whom is God after the flesh. But say this, if you would convince me Christ suffered in the flesh. And if you please to say God suffered in the flesh, then tell me, are God and the flesh the same, or different in nature? If they are the same, then did God suffer in his own nature; for God and the flesh are in nature the same. But if they are different, how does the one suffer in the other, since suffering induces no change in the essence? Thus man does not suffer in a horse; the soul dies not in the flesh, but the flesh is dissolved, and the soul separated therefrom; and yet the man, consisting of soul and body, is called dead, but yet only in that nature which may die, that is, the body, not the immortal soul; for no one has ever said of the soul of man that it has died in the body; but the man, the union of soul and body, has died. Thus the Scriptures, when about to establish the immortality of the soul after death, say the just live forever. An appeal to Scripture condemns altogether these men; for, notwithstanding the number of prophets and apostles, we find nowhere an expression like theirs. On the other hand, that Christ suffered is universally announced. Christ, our pass-over, is offered for us. If Christ be passible, he died for our sins, according to the Scriptures. The cross is Christ's, the body Christ's, the blood Christ's. How is it possible that they can neglect so great a cloud of witnesses, and prefer

their own private judgment to the authority of the Spirit? Thus they would violate the command which forbids to transgress the ancient landmarks that your fathers have placed, and would disregard the decision of the great and holy Council of Nice, the fathers of which council with unanimity have placed in their creed the name of the Lord Jesus Christ next to God the Father; and to him they have ascribed the lofty attributes of Godhead and the beneficial faculties of his own manhood: according to the words of the blessed Paul, other foundation can no man lay than is laid, namely, Jesus Christ. We have not abandoned that foundation—a recipient of glory in one nature, of suffering in the other. If you name him God alone, how can you lay on him the needed passion? If you name him man alone, then how can he contain the vast riches of incomprehensible glory? But it is our duty to call him Christ; hereby he reaps the fruit of glory in the Godhead, while in his manhood he bears suffering, and in the inseparable union works all miracles, and bestows all blessings on the faithful. Thus the impassibility of the Deity, the reality of the passion, and the universal advantage of mankind are made sure. In this manner the clear word of truth, the foundation of unshaken faith, the glorious greatness of the mystery, the marvel worthy of the credence of antiquity, the unfading beauty of orthodoxy, and the harmonious belief of all ages are displayed. To assert this new and wild doctrine, and condemn all who deny that God the Word suffered in the flesh, is not only to oppose the men of this age, but to array an opposition to the doctors and teachers of all antiquity. Why do these men avoid the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, in which we are commanded to believe? Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved. It is lovely to fix the hope of salvation in this name; for there is no other name given among men whereby we may be saved. At the name of Jesus every knee shall bow, of things heavenly and things terrestrial, and of things infernal, and every tongue shall confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father. He is judge of the living and dead. Stephen,

when dying, called on him : Lord Jesus, receive my spirit. There is one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things ; he is Saviour, he is Redeemer. Christ is all these. Why, then, avoid that beloved name ? It hath removed disease : “ In the name of Jesus Christ, arise and walk.” It hath put to flight devils : “ I command thee, in the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, come out of her.” How is it that, leaving this name, as if ungrateful to them, they assume an expression nowhere found among the holy writers : the Word suffered in the flesh ?

AGAINST THOSE WHO INQUIRE, WHY SHOULD THE JEWS BE PUNISHED UNLESS IT WAS GOD WHOM THEY SLEW ?

Argument has no power to restrain the madness of contentious men. If we advance a thousand irrefragable arguments, though they may display the truth, yet will they fail to convince these framers of falsehood ; for it is the punishment of those who, in despite of the clearest of demonstrations, have abandoned the truth, never to leave their own devices nor return to the true road ; but, continuing to travel by headlong by-paths, they are not ashamed to interrogate of us why the Jews shall be punished if they slew not God. Shameless and deceitful impudence ! To avenge Christ they asperse Christ. Thus, that the Jews may be punished, they would confuse all things, despise doctrine, blaspheme the impassible God by calling him passible, revile God’s glory, tear up the order of the universe. Cease to avenge God by blaspheming God ; a defence joined with dishonour to the one defended is detestable. Let Jews receive gain, if their loss is the shame of Christians. Rather let the guilty escape than he who suffered acquire such advocates. Better that Jews be pardoned than the Godhead be reproached with mutability and passibility. Why afford such a theme of boasting to Jews as that they were triumphant over God ? They would have had no power over the temple had not the inmate permitted it, who raised the temple when dissolved, but himself remained indis-

soluble. Your opinion is contrary to the express announcement of the sufferer, and your vindication inflicts a worse grief than the injury you would avenge. Then wherefore distort the compassionate words of the Saviour Christ ; for at the time of the passion he said, Father, forgive them ; they know not what they do. And do you accuse the Jews of a knowledge of the presence of a God, and a conscious pollution of themselves with his blood ? This audacity surpasses that of the crucifying Jews. They killed Christ, deeming him mere man. You, while vindicating God, call him mutable, passible, and dead. Thus, in proportion as that man is more criminal who is impious towards God than he who injures man, so is the state of him more dreadful who, in language, kills God the Word, than theirs who drove the nails into the flesh of the Lord. But though the Jews are less impious than you, we revoke not their awful doom. We maintain the impassibility of the Godhead of Christ, and ascribe passion to the manhood thereto united, and that the Jews shall be punished for impiety towards the manifest Deity through insane rashness and blindness. Even now we see that those who lift up impious hands against the temples of God, and do this sacrilegiously and destructively, are punished as though they were impious criminals in respect of God, notwithstanding that their rage is outwardly directed against stones and wood. If, then, an inanimate temple be guarded by such severe laws, how much severer sanctions should protect that living and unpolluted temple joined ineffably and indissolubly to the living God ! To offer injury or insult to that holy temple must be considered as offering injury and insult to the God who dwelt therein, and who distinguished it by so many miracles. Nor can the Jews find any palliation of their guilt in the circumstance that they appeared to sin against a mere man, while, to confute them, so many miracles wrought by his hand displayed the glorious majesty and power of the Godhead. His birth was pointed out by prophecy, its place was well known, its manner most remarkable, the time of its accomplishment made certain ; every word in Scripture was declaratory of



the event, the Oriental wise men came from afar to worship, a star prognosticated, and angels sang the nativity of the Saviour. Herod the king was troubled; all Judea was filled with wonder, for it was the manifestation of him who should take away the sins of the world. Simeon takes the child in his arms, and calls him the salvation of God. Anna prophesies; John, at Jordan, bears witness to him. The voice of the Father from heaven acknowledges him to all as the well-beloved Son; the descent of the Spirit as a dove on his head confirms and glorifies him; the water changed into wine, and five loaves multiplied to satisfy the hunger of as many thousands, while twelve baskets are filled with the fragments, attest his power. Diseases are healed by his word; devils, expelled by his command, bear witness from afar to the terror of his power; even the dead are at once rescued from the power of the grave; the very hem of his garment brings health to the sick woman, making evident the glory of the concealed God. Even the frame of universal nature, at the time of the passion, and the destruction of the visible temple of his body, is disturbed in divers ways; and those who crucified him bore testimony to the reality of his resurrection; for, while they watched the body of the slain, they were confounded by the omnipotence of the sufferer. These things, and many besides, evinced the hidden Godhead, and to be wilfully blind to these manifestations was a crime of deep impiety against God.

AGAINST THOSE WHO CALL HIM A JEW WHO DENIES THAT GOD  
SUFFERED.

In our former arguments the conclusions were so clear, and so variously and manifestly demonstrated, that our adversaries ought in all fairness to acknowledge their cogency; but this they do not, being intent upon weaving new and deceitful subtleties. Thus, they say he is a Jew who denies that God suffered. It is well that they remind us of a name well suited to themselves. They have drawn upon them-



selves affinity with Jews by denying the salvation of the incarnation, and by rejecting the mystery of the union of the two natures. Let us now imagine whether he is a Jew who receives the gospel of grace, or he who strives for the letter of the law! The gospel teaches us that the invisible God was manifest in visible flesh. The Jews maintain their ancient traditions, wherein the Deity is represented under types and forms. In what manner do we call others Jews who reject the riches of the New Testament? Have we not heard that many prophets and just men have desired to see those things which we have seen, and have not been able? What have they not seen? The God manifest in the flesh. Is it not written, God was seen by Abraham, by Isaac, by Jacob, by Moses, and by many others? That which they desired to see, and were not able, was that which we have seen, the ineffable and indissoluble union of Godhead and manhood. This is the strange sight revealed to all who by faith confess the adorable union of the Word and flesh. They who reject the assumption of human nature are convicted manifestly of affinity with the ancient Jews, who were unable to see the things we have seen. Jews are they who reject the incarnate mediation of the Saviour, and to these must those be added, or, rather, must be considered greater criminals, who deny the two natures. The Jews were unable to perceive the Deity, though working miracles among them; and these revilers of God attribute to the Word the infirmities of the flesh he assumed. But perhaps they will say (for they do not scruple to deny the most evident truths), we do not call the divine nature passible. Should we ask of you, ye cunning sophists, how it is possible that you can avoid this assertion, you would make answer: He suffered because he so willed, and thus is not passible. In this manner you but avoid the letter, while in your faith the error remains. If you condemn such as deny that God suffered, can you escape the inevitable conclusion, God is passible? If he be a Jew, in your opinion, who does not acknowledge that the divine nature suffered, and a Christian who believes it, then

the Jew thus confessing the divine impassibility must be preferred to you who deny it ; for, of necessity, you must be called Jews, maintaining the impassibility, or Christians, as you would define the word, holding to the passibility of God. Then tell us plainly to which doctrine you subscribe ; for with the heart man believes to justification, and with the mouth confession is made to salvation. If the Word did not suffer, then the flesh did suffer. If neither suffered, then some third essence suffered. If nothing suffered, then there was no passion. If the passion took place, and yet no one suffered, it was but an illusion ; we are saved by a mere illusion. You are as impious as the Manicheans ; and why do you hesitate to adopt their name, when manifestly you are inheritors of their heresy ? Hence is your error shown to be worse than that of the Jews, and nearly as impious as that of the Manicheans. Why mention Jews and Manicheans ? You are more resolved in guilt than he, the contriver of all evil and hater of all good—who hath planted these tares in your heart—the devil. He, when, at Jordan, the divine glory of the Saviour was manifested, though urged by the stings of envy, dared not begin the temptation till he saw Jesus fainting with hunger, an undoubted sign of human weakness. He well knew the attribute of the Godhead to be subject to neither temptation nor passion. You ascribe to the Godhead hunger, thirst, and similar infirmities,\* and dare annex the suffering of crucifixion thereto. He (the devil), for the magnitude of his guilt, was called a murderer from the beginning ; you, in the greatness of your mad impiety towards God, call the Jews the slayers of God, and do not blush in allowing greater power to the Jews, the disciples, than to the devil, the teacher of all wickedness ; and thus, according to the accusation of the Scripture, knowing God, you have not glorified him as God ; for you have maintained his passibility.—(*Athanasius's Works*, vol. ii., p. 305–318, *Ed. of Cologne*, 1686.)





















